

A  
R E V I E W  
of a late Heterodox  
C A T E C H I S M,  
Together with the  
V I N D I C A T I O N  
of that  
R E V I E W.

---

By  
J O S E P H H A C O N,  
Sometimes of *Queen's* College  
in *Cambridge*.

---

*C A M B R I D G E,*

Printed by *J. F.* and are to be sold by *J. H.*  
Bookseller in *Cambridge*, 1668.

72-2014





A  
P R E F A C E  
Concerning  
The Authour and his Work.

**T**Here would have been little need of inviting the Reader to a perusal of these Books, if it had not happened to the Authour of them, by reason of his retired abode in a small Village, and of his singular Modesty whensoever he convers'd, to have labour'd under the disadvantage of an obscure Name. His Life was an unwearied course of Study, in relation to which it is not easie to determine whether his Parts or his Diligence excelled. So that by these two sufficient Causes he became a great Master in divers kinds of Learning, but most of all in Philologic, to which he had a very peculiar inclination. A Study wherein he satisfy'd himself, though it did not very much recommend him to the men of the present Age. For the greater number of them, committing the Ancients to dust and worms, seem to consult their ease and reputation in the more compendious study of some new-

\* 3      imagi-

## The Preface concerning

*imagined Systeme of the World; whereby they are furnished in a short time with that talkative Learning which qualifies them for such Discourse as is agreeable to the Genius of the Times. In the following Papers the Reader will meet with some strokes from the Pen of a true Critick; in which if the Authour appears sparing, that is not owing to the slenderness of his Stock, but to the Penury of that Matter which was laid before him by another's hand: and, doubtless, if he had chosen his own Province, he would have adorned it with a greater variety of uncommon Learning. But it was part of his unhappy task to pursue the errors and digressions of a confused Adversary, and not to be employ'd in the steady pursuit of an Argument of his own choice, whereby these Treatises are rendred, in some sort, the less considerable; for every one knows the motions in appointed Measures to be more gracefull then the disordered steps of a Wild-goose-chace. Our Authour sometimes express'd his sense of this Matter, and was ready to wish (had it not been in vain) that he had never engaged, and was resolved never to proceed farther in this present Controversie, wherein he was oblig'd to follow the Ramble of an Adversary who would never tread a certain path of method; who would never be out of breath, but multiply words when his reason fail'd; and with whom the Contention was unequall, seeing, though he were bound hand and foot, he would esteem himself victorious, so*

## The Authour and his Work.

long as he could cry out or spit against him. Our Authour answered his Reproches, and ruder style, and novel Opinions, with modest language, and a chaste dialect, and sinewie Reason. He unravell'd that entangled skain of Antinomian, Socinian and Arminian Doctrines which his Adversary had twisted together most unskilfully, and with as little Art as he has since shew'd in his setting together of the transposed Letters of that Name, upon which he has bestow'd (before his late Funerall-Sermon) most pleasant Anagrams. Concerning the Antinomian Way and the Principles of Socinus, he abhorr'd them equally with all those who have any regard to a Holy life, to the most obvious sense of Scripture, to the universal suffrage of the primitive Church. As for the Doctrines of Arminius, if they had been fairly stated, and delivered in that due Moderation which they are capable of, our Authour was a man of too great Reason vehemently to have oppos'd them. The truth is, he alwaies kept himself in the middle way betwixt the rigidest of the Calvinists and the loosest of the Remonstrants: which way, betwixt Extremes in Opinion, as it does frequently secure the soundness of mens Judgements, so does it alwaies make evident the excellencie of their Tempers; although it doth expose them to hatred and malice, whilst, in their even passage, they are push'd at on either hand by Intemperate Zelots.



*A Review of M<sup>r</sup> HORN'S Catechisme :  
and some few of his Questions and Answers  
noted, by J. H. of Malsingham, p. Norf.*

**W**Hile I trouble not my Reader with other Preface, I must not omit to give him notice of thus much at the first ; that M<sup>r</sup> Horn's Catechisme, called *Brief Instructions for children*, was brought me by a friend, with this small request that I would peruse it; which though I might perhaps have seen before ; yet as then, had I not read so much as one entire page of it, howsoever it had been extant for above the space of five years. But for the next request he made, that I would let him know what I thought of it, especially some of the Answers in it ; it was not enough to tell him that he knew, the better of the two, how to judge of it : and for his further desire, that I would write something in brief, touching what I thought therein to be unsound ; it might not suffice to say, That to be *Censor librorum*, or but *libelli*, was too high and hard a task for me, though it were but in a private way: so that the motion with some earnestness redoubled, took place with him that is of this minde, that whoso with importunity sets another on work, stands reasonably charged, in some sort, with the faults and failings.

In the mean time, and in such a licentious season, wherein every opinion dares boldly bring a voucher

ready; though we can do little else, we cannot but complain, that whatsoever libertie be given to other Discourses, some of them too wilde and scathfull; books of Christian Institution, which lay down the first Principles, should be no more heeded and lookt after, but pass abroad without all censure and inspection: That Catechismes which are the publick cisterns or receptacles, made and framed the better to hold the water derived from the spring of Gods holy word, for benefit of the young and ignorant, should be no better preserved and guarded, to the intent that nothing noxious or unwholsome be injected. The law of God severely forbade his people, to remove the land-marks that their forefathers had set down and fastened: and the Romanes from *Numa* thus, *Qui terminum exarâsit, ipse & boves sacri sunt*: there may be cause given oftentimes to posteritie, entangled in endless contentions, to curse the memorie of those who pluck up that which they never set. Articles of Religion, and confessions of Faith, and forms of Catechisme, are the sacred terms and bounds of particular churches, fixed as the surest conservatours of peace, as well as of the truth.

But as the laws, are not made for the righteous, whose obedience moveth from a stronger spring; but for the unrighteous, loose and irregular: so these limits now spoken of, are chiefly for the ignorant and unstable; for the untaught, that are in danger to be ill taught; for such as make the multitude  
one

one of their marks, whereby to finde out the truth of Christianitie; for other Christians, who are faithfull in the land, and are firmly built upon that truth which they have learned of men, but not of men onely; they make good the want of outward order, and supply the defect of humane Authoritie, by their greater care and diligence; that they may not be found as chaff when the floor is purged with the fan of heresie and schisme; that they may save themselves, and others, so far as they may, from an untoward and backsliding generation: as Davids zeal was the more kindled, because of others wickedness: *They have made void thy law*, saith he, *Therefore I love thy commandments.*

No marvel is it, of such persons as this authour is, who dread and deprecate all national establishment of Religion, as sanguinary persecution; but matter of wonder is it as well as grief, that any of those that worthily lament the breaking down of the hedge, should be among the first of them, that lay to their hands to spoil the vines: and being aggrieved at the removal of that government, which is indeed the best simply, and as I think the best always, should be with the forwardest, to take advantage of no government at all, whereby to spread and propagate opinions most contrariant and destructive to the doctrine of our Church, when it was rightly constituted. But while I speak of limit and good order, it is fit to keep my self to what I am about.

In the title of these Brief instructions, that clause

*may best serve the capacitie of children* ] might well have been omitted, unless he had meant to leave out that which follows in the title, concerning the great mysteries, there specified; and that which follows, and bears a great proportion in the book, concerning the *Quinquarticular* controversies: For think you these to be fit matter of instruction for children? If this be milk, I wonder what he counteth strong meat. Heretofore it hath been said, that these things should be argued in schools, among the learned, and not be made the subject of our Homilies *ad populum*, or treated of in vulgar auditories, to fall upon these points *there*, was a matter of presentment, and an iniquitie to be punished, and have they already found so large a room in brief Instructions for children?

Solomon giveth this warning in the 17 of the Proverbs, *Qui attollit ostium, querit ruinam*; He that exalteth his gate seeketh destruction: whether it be a moral caution against vain pretences, and high presumptions; or oeconomicall, advising men to beware of over-chargeable and too costly structures, lest they be unable to go on, and finish; and for want of foresight, come at last to build themselves quite out of doors. [*The great mysteries of redemption, faith, works, law, gospel, of predestination, election, reprobation opened*] appears at first approach, too high a gate, too lofty a frontispiece for a childrens Catechisme: but I cannot beleieve that ever he thought these points so needfull to be learned at  
first



first beginning: that was not the chief intent. The young ones must betimes be prepossessed with a vile opinion of the *present pretended Orthodox*: and this is the scope of many of the Answers they are to learn: *Hannibals* father brought him along to the Altar, and made him lay hold on it with his hands, and there he swore him against the Romanes, when he was but nine years old. And the children must be brought early to know their foes, and what they are against whom they must bend their forces, and emptie their quivers: not against the Papists, nor the Anabaptists, nor the Socinians: no danger being feared now, it seems, from any of these: but the pretended orthodox that walk by vote, and Elders tradition. Against these they must be taught to beleieve, that they are of a *Satanical persuasion*. Answ. 199. and that they hold most horrible impieties. Answ. 298. with other reproaches, and all for beleieving Gods free and saving grace, and that he doth not love all men alike. And these Answers they are to get by heart, and lay them up in the store-house of their memorie, that so they may be ready at all times to give an account to him that asketh, of the malice that is in them: howbeit the Apostle saith, In understanding be ye men, but in malice be ye children, as if malice, uncharitableness and hatred of others, were not to be found in *them*, nor are they so comparatively, unless it be where such instructions as these are planted. But it is the surest way, and that he know-

eth well, to train them up early in the way he would have them go, that so they may not depart from it in their older age; to fill them with animosities so soon as they be capable against the persons and opinions of their adversaries. As there is no friendship to that which is called *Prætextata amicitia*: according as the Scolium, a kinde of song, in *Athenæus* makes it the fourth point of felicitie *συνβῆναι ὡς τῇ φίλῳ* that is, to have neighbourhood and acquaintance with such as have been brought up together with us from our childhood: so there is no enmitie like that which children are seasoned with all, at their first setting out, and bred in from their green and tender years: *Crescent illi, crescetis & ira*; As they grow up, their disaffections also increase and gather strength with them. But if abrenunciations, and negative positions have been thought unfit, and importune to be thrust into a Confession of Faith, or Articles of Religion agreed upon; then doubtless, such condemnation of contrary errors, as doth involve the parties also, and reflect upon the persons, doth much less become the delivery of the very first principles.

In the Preface is t'is profession made.

" I do indeed about the goodness of God towards, and  
 " the death of Christ for men, varie from the common-  
 " road of the present pretended orthodox, because they  
 " leave the Scripture-road, and walk in a by-path of  
 " some Elders tradition. I would have you and yours  
 " with my self, not walk by vote, but by rule, the word  
 " of God.]

The

The road is not therefore to be forsaken, because it is common: as *multitude* is the *Papists* mist, which they would cast before our eyes; so is *paucity* the *Anabaptists*: but God hath given us no such rule as either: and as it is unthankfulness, and worse than so, when God hath given Kings and worldly powers to propagate and cherish Christian Religion, then to crie out, *Not many noble*; so is it also, when as the nations do flie as a cloud of Doves to the windows of the Church, and God fulfills his gracious promises of multiplying beleivers as the sand, or the stars, or the numberless drops of dew from the mornings womb, then to crie out of following the multitude, or walking in a common road. “[*Not by vote, saith he, nor by mans precept, but by the word of God.*]” *Ans.* Vote, and the rule of Gods word may be, not contrary but subordinate. Might not the 39 *Articles*, for instance, the *Assemblies Catechisme* or *Confession*, be framed by the rule of Gods word, and yet be voted too? If a single Pastour write a Catechisme, and frame Answers, that he would have his parishioners, or people over whom he is set, to learn, and get by heart, are they not now taught by the precept and appointment of man? Is there not as much lording or dominion over the faith of others, in a parish, or small congregation, as there is in a Diocesis, Province, or Nation? Should we in earnest walk after this Tradition, here plainly taught and delivered; as the Jews in the Prophet Jeremy are said to multiplie their

their gods, *secundum numerum civitatum*, according to the number of their cities; so must we multiplie our Creeds *secundum numerum capitum*, so that every particular person may have a form of faith by himself: which is the very spirits and heart of Anabaptisme. And I do verily beleieve, that not onely the more judicious sort of his charge and neighbourhood, but very children that are of any capacity, will think it far safer, in matters of difference, to follow the judgement of *many* pious learned men, than of *One*, though he were equally qualified with the best of them.

And as to the particular, touching which he now enters his dissent; he loveth to raise a perpetual dust, wheresoever he goeth, about the extent and intention of benefit by Christs death, and injuriously chargeth his adversaries, with broad denial of Scripture sayings, because they interpret one sentence by another, and are unwilling to make use of the universal particle *All*, or *Every one*, therewithall to overthrow the contents of the Gospel, and as with a helve or handle, to cut down the chief trees of the forrest. And whatsoever he talketh here of the *Scripture-road*, and rule of Gods word: as if this were it, that did bear the sway with him, and carry him on so strongly; I have cause to suspect it to be but talk, out of what I finde in a late work of his, called *Essays*: for pag. 24. he observeth that those words Act. 13. 48. were no part of *Pauls* doctrine by him then preached, but onely an  
assertion

assertion of *Luke*, the writer of the Apostles Acts: and telleth us further, that it is safer to stick to *Paul*, than to *Luke*, if they disagree, though he thinketh here he can reconcile them.

But will he indeed stick to the Apostle *Paul*? Neither, for pag. 36. He telleth us that those places in *Paul's* Epistles, which seem to clash with Gods willing all men to be saved, and in particular, that discourse of his Rom. 9. Are those places hard to be understood that *Peter* speaketh of 2 Epist. 3. 16. So that he hath bethought himself, how he may easily answer all that can be brought against him, out of the Apostle *Paul*, the Champion of free grace though he be; for if the argument that is brought be hard to be answered; then the place whence it is taken, is hard to be understood; and it must be supposed not to be rightly understood, so long as it shall seem to cross the Universalists. And thus in stead of walking by others vote, he plainly and peremptorily walketh by his own will, and without regard, or heed taken, wresteth to his purpose that very Scripture, that warneth us of the fearfull danger of wresting any.

*"I doubt not but you shall finde nothing therein, but what is wholesome, and may look my worst adversaries boldly in the face.*

*Ans<sup>w</sup>.* That is not always the best, that looks the boldest. Truth may be confident, but falshood hath the greater faculty of out-facing, and clamouring,

their gods, *secundum numerum civitatum*, according to the number of their cities; so must we multiplie our Creeds *secundum numerum capitum*, so that every particular person may have a form of faith by himself: which is the very spirits and heart of Anabaptisme. And I do verily beleieve, that not onely the more judicious sort of his charge and neighbourhood, but very children that are of any capacity, will think it far safer, in matters of difference, to follow the judgement of *many* pious learned men, than of *One*, though he were equally qualified with the best of them.

And as to the particular, touching which he now enters his dissent; he loveth to raise a perpetual dust, wheresoever he goeth, about the extent and intention of benefit by Christs death, and injuriously chargeth his adversaries, with broad denial of Scripture sayings, because they interpret one sentence by another, and are unwilling to make use of the universal particle *All*, or *Every one*, therewithall to overthrow the contents of the Gospel, and as with a helve or handle, to cut down the chief trees of the forrest. And whatsoever he talketh here of the *Scripture-road*, and rule of Gods word: as if this were it, that did bear the sway with him, and carry him on so strongly; I have cause to suspect it to be but talk, out of what I finde in a late work of his, called *Essays*: for pag. 24. he observeth that those words Act. 13. 48. were no part of *Pauls* doctrine by him then preached, but onely an  
assertion

assertion of *Luke*, the writer of the Apostles Acts: and telleth us further, that it is safer to stick to *Paul*, than to *Luke*, if they disagree, though he thinketh here he can reconcile them.

But will he indeed stick to the Apostle *Paul*? Neither, for pag. 36. He telleth us that those places in *Paul's* Epistles, which seem to clash with Gods willing all men to be saved, and in particular, that discourse of his Rom. 9. Are those places hard to be understood that *Peter* speaketh of 2 Epist. 3. 16. So that he hath bethought himself, how he may easily answer all that can be brought against him, out of the Apostle *Paul*, the Champion of free grace though he be; for if the argument that is brought be hard to be answered; then the place whence it is taken, is hard to be understood; and it must be supposed not to be rightly understood, so long as it shall seem to cross the Universalists. And thus in stead of walking by others vote, he plainly and peremptorily walketh by his own will, and without regard, or heed taken, wresteth to his purpose that very Scripture, that warneth us of the fearfull danger of wresting any.

*"I doubt not but you shall finde nothing therein, but what is wholesome, and may look my worst adversaries boldly in the face."*

*Ans<sup>w</sup>.* That is not always the best, that looks the boldest. Truth may be confident, but falshood hath the greater faculty of out-facing, and clamouring,

ing, *obstreperus adulter sensus*, and with making continued noise, drowneth all that can be said against it. And I think that very seldome comes forth any one piece into the light, that is of such happy composition, and of such proof thorowout, from head to heel, that it may not by a watchfull eye be found penetrable, in some one part or other. Wherefore considering what ought to be thought upon, humane frailty, and how prone men are to be overseen and mistaken; and considering also how moral it is, and withall, how usual, for the best of all, to bespeak their Readers civility, and incline him to a favourable interpretation, of what may perhaps not be able to abide a strict *examen*; In these regards, I think it was but needlessly done, and unadvisedly, to fasten such a commendation, and so emphatical, upon the forehead of his own book, as will outvie any ordinary approbation drawn up by them that give their licence to anothers; and may hold pace with those Encomiasticks, that take their licence poetical now and then, to flatter and hyperbolize. *Nothing* (at all) to be *found* (upon search) but may *look in the face*, and that *boldly*, my *adversaries*, yea the *worst of them*, and all this, without any *doubt*. For who will think that he deserves favour and connivence, that makes a solemn protestation against them, as no way needfull in his case.

Far, far be it from Christian ingenuity, to take that ill, that is well spoken; or what is ill, to make it worse than it is; or to disesteem what is good and solid,



solid, because it comes bound up and joyned with that which is unsound and noxious. I do here, once for all, willingly acknowledge the far greater part of these instructions, to be, as far as I do discern, very godly, sound, and rational, well agreeing with Gods holy word, and the confessions of Reformed Churches, and dexterously delivered, and fitted to the apprehension of those, to whom they were intended. But withall, the writer of them cannot justly be offended, if the dead flies, be by a wary hand, though not so skilfull as were meet, taken forth of his box of ointment. The which is the more needfull to be done, because the better the greater part is, the more likely it may serve to make the bad, that is mixed, and interwoven, to pass unsuspected, and be swallowed down. Such deceitfull dealing may possibly be used; and it is thought that phrase, *cauponari verbum*, is taken from the vintrey, where sometimes the good doth help to put off, and vend the naught. It is good to be sober, and suspicious: and our blessed Saviour, who bade the people hear the Pharisees: bade them also beware of the leaven of the Pharisees: and his sheep are taught, to distinguish, betwixt wholesome food and venomous though springing near together: and as they wax in spiritual strength, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil, and to separate that which is precious from that which is vile. So much for the Preface.

- “ Qu. I. **W** *Hat is the chief thing thou oughtest to exercise thy self to, in thy youth ?*  
 “ A. To remember, minde, or consider my Creators.

*Creators* ] A word, never before, as I think, heard of in our Church. All the Churches Christian have been forbidden, by the Catholick Religion, to say, there be Three Lords, or Three Almightyes : and why not, Three Creators also ? for so he saith, that saith *Creators*, because of the Trinitie of Persons, according as his Answer is to the fifth Question. But he consulted the Original, and found it so, as we are told in his margin : but he should withall have been advised by them that are skilfull in the Hebrew, whether Jews or Christians, and then perhaps he would have found it to be no more than *Enallage numeri*, one number for another, the plural put for the singular. Every one is to be credited in his own art, and every one in his own language. *Mercer*, of whom *Thuanus* spared not to write, *Neminem unquam Christianum feliciter Hebraisasse*, would not turn it, *Memento Creatorum*: but this he tells us there, that the Jews, *de Deo passim solent loqui pluraliter*, when they speak of God, use to speak in the plural number. And *Aben-Ezra* goes further, as I finde him in *M<sup>r</sup> Seldens* Titles ; Every tongue, saith he, hath its property. As it is honourable in the languages of Europe for an inferiour to speak to a great man by the plu-

thing exerciſe conſi-  
 al number: So likewise in the holy tongue it is honour-  
 able, to ſpeak of a Potentate plurally, as *Adonim*, *Baalim* ] the Idiom of their language is not of God  
 onely, but of any great Perſon, to ſpeak in the plu-  
 ral number.

*Amama* might have ſatiſfied him in this matter :  
 who cenſureth the Vulgar for *Deos alienos*, in the firſt  
 precept, and thinks with *Drufius*, and divers Papifts,  
 it ſhould be, *Deum alium*: if therefore the Catechiſt  
 intended to alter the Engliſh verſion, and ſhift the  
 numbers, he ſhould have done it for the better, and  
 not for the worſe. 1 *Sam.* 28. 13. *I ſaw gods aſcend-*  
*ing.* They may alledge good reaſon, who make it  
*Divum aſcendentem*, I ſaw a god aſcending, or riſing  
 up out of the earth, ( *Samuel* was a Judge, and Jud-  
 ges are gods ) whom we have reaſon to hear for  
 congruities ſake, who read that which follows thus;  
 What form is *HE* of? in the ſingular. When  
*Zanchy* had written *De tribus Elohim*, *Grotius* took  
 exception at that Title; and *Ludovicus Capellus* de-  
 fendeth it ſo, that withall he excuſeth it, as Cata-  
 chreſtical, and an *ἀνυπολόγια*. It is not good truſting  
 children and common people, with ſuch expreſſions,  
 as offend ſome, and put others, of the learnedeſt men  
 that this preſent age hath ſeen, to explicate and mol-  
 lifie. Yet I enter not the Controverſie, in which ſo  
 great parties are diſſenting, What ſoliditie or  
 ſtrength of Argument, may be had from hence,  
 for the Article of the Sacred Trinity: I inſiſt onely  
 upon this; The Noveltie, & the Scandal, of rendring  
 ſuch words plurally in vulgar languages. Q. 25.

“Q. 25. *Why addest thou that word*  
 “*sinfull? are there any lusts of the flesh no?*  
 “*sinfull?*

“A. Yes, such desires as be and pro-  
*Deut. 12. 15.* “ceed from the weakness of nature, and  
*John 4. 7, 8.* “tend to the due preservation of man, as  
*Hebr. 13. 4.* “to eat when one is hungry; drink when  
 “one is thirsty, &c. which being ordered  
 “according to Gods word, are lawfull and  
 “not renounced by us.

I think him much mistaken in unfolding those words of our Church-Catechisme [*The sinfull lusts of the flesh*]. It had been a good work to have instructed his scholars, in the right meaning of the word *flesh*, as it is taken in that place. The *Jews*, as *Buxtorfius* tells us in his *Synagoga*, when their children come to be past seven, are wont to learn them *Nomenclations*, and how to call and know by the right names, those things that are of daily use in life and common converse. Without presumption to give direction, a great part may be allotted in the first institution, to the explication of Divinitie-terms, for want of which, wholesome and sound discourses are often either quite lost, or serve to breed in men, mistakes and errors.

Our three enemies, to be fought against, and renounced, are the *World*, the *Flesh*, and the *Devil*. Now in this Answer Mr *Horn* takes the word *Flesh*, for the work of God, or created nature, even such as

was in our blessed Saviour, as by his text of *Joh. 4.* appears. But it is not the *sinfull* lusts of the Flesh; it is the *Flesh*, which in Scripture ordinarily, without any manner of Addition, is spoken of, as our Spiritual enemy, and it signifies, not the Body, nor yet sense and appetite, inferiour to reason; but it signifies the corruption of our nature, repugnant to the Law of God, defiling Body and Soul, and the highest faculties of the minde. And thus the best of Popish expositours interpret the word; howsoever others of them so give the meaning, that many of their common followers, think that to crucifie the flesh, is to starve themselves; as they think that to renounce the world, is to go into a Monastery, where they enjoy the plenty of the world, without the trouble that belongs to it. A man would think, saith Saint *Augustine*, *De Civ. Dei, lib. 14. cap. 2.* that the Epicureans lived according to the flesh, because they followed bodily pleasures: and the Stoicks according to the Spirit, because they placed happiness in the minde; *Sed sicut loquitur Scriptura divina, secundum carnem vivere utrique monstrantur*: but according as the holy Scripture speaketh, both of them live according to the flesh. That which deceived him, was, as I suppose, the Epithet of *sinfull*: as if therefore some lusts of the flesh were not sinfull. Whereas Epithets are not always put for distinction, but often for Amplification and Efficacy. So may we read *Fastum aquor, gelidum Borcam*, for Emphasis, and not Difference: and in *Hebr. 12. 23. Spiritus iusto-*

*rum perfectorum*: out of which one of the Pontifician writers would prove Purgatory: This sheweth, saith he; that there are spirits of just men, not yet made perfect. A weak argument: as it was a wicked one of another, that said the Apostle *Peter* did insinuate some service of Idols to be lawfull, because he said, 1 *Epist.* 4. 3. according to their vulgar, *illicitis idolorum cultibus*, unlawfull services of Idols.

The World, Flesh, and Devil, which we have renounced, are enumerated by the Apostle, *Ephes.* 2. v. 2, and 3. *This world*, said he there: our Church added an Epithet, *This wicked world*. *The lusts of our Flesh*, said the Apostle: our Church added an Epithet, *sinfull lusts*; but neither of them for difference, but for Emphasis and Aggravation.

---

Qu. and Answ. 40. in marg.

“ *It was called the Tree of knowledge*  
 “ *of Good and Evil, because God therein*  
 “ *would try, whether man would do good or*  
 “ *evil; and Adam had therein distincti-*  
 “ *on of good and evil.*

*Good and Evil* here, do not signifie, Duty, and Sin; or, Obedience, and Disobedience; but *Happiness, and Misery*: happiness to be enjoyed; and misery to be undergone.

And *Knowledge* here, signifieth *Experience*, or, as we commonly call it, *Usefull Experience*; when the

shoul

should know Good by the losse of it, and Evil by the sense of it. Howsoever Satan took occasion from the name, to abuse the womans credulity, and curiosity, as if she should have attained some rare knowledge, that would have made her blessed, and even God-like.

As therefore the one of the two, was called the Tree of Life, so might the other be called, for so it was, the Tree of Death, and plainly they were told, that whensoever they did eat of it, they should die the death. This being the reason of the name, as it is in a manner agreed upon by all, I marvell why our Authour should balk it, and give us two other reasons why it is called the tree of Knowledge; whereof, the one is obscure; and the other unsound, referring it to Gods knowledge, as if God did thereby come to know what man would do.

Yet should I not have noted this, or made any stay at it, but that I know how far the Socinians have gone in denial of Divine Prescience, and what haste some of the Remonstrants make in following after them, and what Doctrine one of the prime Universalists delivered long ago, namely, *Fr. Puccius* in his Catholick Assertion of the Efficacie of Christs Death in all men, as they are men; confuted both by Papist and Protestant above threescore years now past. *The ways of Men and Angels*, saith he, *before the fall, and after the fall, which they might have gone in, and did not, as well as those they did go in, were both alike foreseen of God; not these, more then those; ad id*

*ne juxta sensum humanum possemus dicere cum ignorasse que nos contingentia dicimus.*

I grant that in holy Scripture, God is said to *Tempt* or *trie*, and no more then that is said here; and that in *Genes. 22. 12.* *Now I know thou fearest God*, is just as much as is said, *v. 1. God did tempt Abraham.* But who knoweth not, that this, and many the like are spoken *humanitè*, in a manner of speech borrowed from men; as when he doeth, as a man being angry useth to do; then is he said to be *angry*: and when he doeth, as a man that repenteth him of any thing, useth to do, then is he said to *repent*: So commanding Abraham to offer his son, yet not intending that he should offer him, he is said to *tempt*, or *trie* him, because he did *ad similitudinem tentantis*, after the manner of men, who will usually do or say this, or that, onely to learn or know, the purpose or disposition of another, as yet unknown. And in like sort it may be said, that God did tempt or trie Adam, in the Precept touching the tree of knowledge: But then, first, let us not make more figurative or tropical locutions than need, or than there are. And secondly, whatsoever improper speeches there are found in Gods word; that should be proper, and plain, and easie, that is intended for the capacity and instruction of children. They should be told, and the common people also, what irreligious principles, those who plead so hard, for Their libertie of mans will, after all their tragical declamations, are forced to maintain, that so they may tremble to



set foot in such ways, as necessarily, and naturally end, among other things, in denying Gods foreknowledge of humane actions. For what good Christian is there that will not soon take check at this, though but meanly seasoned with Religion?

---

In the Question and Answer 83. he sheweth how Christ did exercise the office, of a Prophet, of a King, and of a Priest; of the last, in these words.

*“As a Priest he prepared the sacrifice to be offered up  
“to God, for us, and made intercession, both for his  
“Disciples, and transgressours.*

*“Q. 86. What was the Sacrifice that  
“as a Priest, he prepared to offer for us?*

*“A. But one propitiatory Sacrifice,  
“which was himself, or his own body.*

*“Q. 87. How did he prepare himself  
“this Sacrifice?*

*A. By giving up himself in obedience to his Father, a ransom for us,  
“from sin and death.*

*“Q. 88. How did he that?*

*“A. In that being made under the  
“law for us, he accordingly yeilded  
“himself to death to bear the curse  
“due unto us.*

*“Q. 102. How did & doth he more fully  
“exercise his Priestly office in Heavens?*

*Hebr.* 8. 1, 4.

and 9. 14.

*Psal.* 110. 1, 4.

*Lev.* 8. 9. with

*Hebr.* 7. 27.

and 9. 12, 24.

and 7. 25.

“ *A.* He in his Ascension offered  
 “ and presented himself, as the prepared  
 “ Sacrifice to his Father, and was there-  
 “ by consecrated the great high Priest  
 “ entred within the veil, with the ver-  
 “ tues of his own bloud, to appear in  
 “ the presence of God for us, and to  
 “ make intercession.

The preparatives, that were, to Christs death, or Sacrifice of himself, we may call those infirmities, which together with our nature, he took upon him: meaning not personal infirmities, as diseases, or distempers, of this or that sort, but such as accompany mankinde in general, hunger, thirst, weariness, fear, pain, grief, and mortalitie: we may reckon also his devout obedience, his humilitie, & voluntary humiliation, or empoverishing of himself, his vehement supplications, with strong crying and tears. As these, did forego his Sacrifice, so did they prepare for it: but that his death should be a preparation to his Sacrifice; and that his Sacrifice should onely be prepared on earth, and offered in Heaven; is a new part of learning, and soundeth somewhat strange, out of what shop soever it came and to what purpose soever it was first forged.

Our Church hath taught us, that Christ suffering upon the cross, did make **THERE**, a full, perfect & sufficient Sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, and our Saviour said upon the Cross, *It is finished.*  
 And

And when the Apostle to the Colossians, c. 2. v. 14. saith that the handwriting was blotted out, and taken out of the way, or, out of sight, and (to make it past all fear of ever being produced against us) that it was nailed to his cross, that is, cancelled, and torn in pieces; there needeth nothing more to be said, to let us know that there needeth nothing more to be done, for perfecting the Sacrifice and expiation. For whether he speaketh in reference to the Ceremonial, or the moral law or both, it was a full and complete Sacrifice to the purpose intended. And holy Scripture plainly speaketh of his death, and Sacrifice, as precisely the same: the altar being the cross, and no other propitiatory Sacrifice, but his body crucified and dead. Hebr. 9. 26, 28. Christ must not *offer* often, because he must not *suffer* often, and he must not *suffer often*, because it is appointed for men *once*, and but once to die: To *offer*, and to *suffer*, and to *die*; are in this case, made the very same thing. And even in common speech, and in common sense, the sacrifice of any thing consisteth in the killing of it: and if it be of a thing inanimate, then it consisteth in the consuming of it: but neither killing nor consuming, is the preparing of the Sacrifice. Where was Christ slain? was it not upon the earth? yes: and shall he be sacrificed in heaven? or where was ever the killing the sacrifice, called the preparing of it?

There was among the Jews, the Preparation of the Pass-over; and the killing of the Pass-

over, and the eating of the Pass-over, these three; It is true that the killing of it, did prepare for the eating of it. But the eating of it, was the *Sacrament* of it, not the *Sacrifice* of it. The places or texts of Scripture, such as carry any colour, may be considered. Hebr. 8. 4. *For if he were on earth, he should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law.* ] From which words, he may as well gather, that Jesus Christ was not a Priest at all, upon earth, as that he did not complete his sacrifice upon earth: but it was granted he was a Priest in preparing the Sacrifice. Answ. to Qu. 83. By shewing the meaning of that place, his mistake will appear. The Apostle preferreth Jesus Christ before the Levitical High Priest, among many other respects, in this for one, The place, where now he is. Our High Priest is in heaven, made higher then the heavens, c. 7. v. 26. c. 8. v. 1. A minister of the Sanctuary, vers. 2. that is, The Holy of Holies, the Oracle, or most sacred Quire, wherein, under the law, the High Priest onely did officiate: which place, as formerly, it did typifie, so here it doth signifie heaven it self. On this, dependeth the fourth verse: wherein he proveth that if Christ be a Priest, as that ~~he~~ was taken for granted; he must be a Priest in heaven, for if he were on earth, he should not be so much as a Priest, much less a High Priest. For Priests on earth offer gifts prescribed by the Levitical law: such gifts Christ did not offer: such a Priest therefore  
Christ

Christ was not, he was not of the tribe of Levi: no Levitical Priest, therefore he offered no Levitical gifts: other earthly Priests there are to do that. Therefore must he be a Priest offering in heaven, or no Priest at all. Now our Catechist should have considered, how these words, in verse 4. are brought in, and to what they belong, the Apostle speaketh not now of sacrifices, slain and offered in the Temple, by the Priests; but of such oblations as were made by the High Priest in the most holy place, into which he entred once a year, and thereby did shadow out our High Priest, who entred into heaven, and offered there such services as we needed, after that he had finished the Sacrifice of himself on earth.

In this Epistle are often mentioned, and distinguished, gifts, and sacrifices: in this fourth verse, onely gifts are named; all sacrifices are gifts, but all gifts are not sacrifices. Our High Priest being ascended into heaven, offereth, as a Gift, not as a Sacrifice, himself; and the merit of his passion, as the High Priest carryed the blood into the Oracle: And as Aaron did bear the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast, so doth our High Priest, the names of all his faithfull people: he offereth prayers for them, and incense with their prayers, that they may be accepted.

But especially he would abuse his Reader here upon the Homonymie or ambiguity of the word, offer: which though by frequent use it be in some sort

fort appropriate to sacrifices, yet is it sometimes otherwise used, as, To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, *offer* also the other; and, if he shall ask an egg, will he *offer* him a scorpion? it may mean no more than to tender, exhibit, shew: no more than to proffer, produce, or bring forth: as much as to present, or represent, if we take this word, after the Latine use, which is, to bring forth any thing and make it present. *Suetonius* of the Emperour *Claudius*: *pænas parricidarum representabat*, he would see them suffer before his face, or in his presence. Such is the use of it in *Cyprian*, and often in *Tertullian*. And in this sense did our High Priest offer himself at the throne of Majesty; on the *cross* he offered his *Sacrifice*; but in *heaven*, he presenteth his *Gift*, his body, his merits, his prayers, his incense, our names also, or persons, in some sort; gifts or services, all of them, but *Sacrifice* none of them.

These two words [*offer* and *present*] are coupled together in the Answer thus. He in his Ascension offered, and presented himself as the prepared Sacrifice to his Father ] To offer a prepared Sacrifice, is one thing; which Christ then did not; it is another to present himself, who was before offered in Sacrifice; and thus did our Priest and Advocate, and Intercessour, appear in the presence of God for us, *Hebr. 9. 24.*

So this is the abuse, to make us beleeve, that because whatsoever is presented *may* be said to be *offered*, therefore it must be offered as a *Sacrifice*.

Another

Another Text is, Psal. 110. *Thou art a Priest for ever.* The eternity of his Priesthood can be no where but in heaven. Therefore, no where but in heaven was his Sacrifice perfected. Thus he seemeth to argue thence. *Ans.* Priest, and Sacrifice, are relative, where one is, the other is also. A priest must offer sacrifice; but it is not requisite that he should do it always *in actu exercito*, it is enough that it be done *in actu signato*; that is, that he *will* offer, or *hath* offered, or *can*, according to Law and Rite, offer sacrifice. Jesus Christ is a Priest for ever, but he doth not ever, or always sacrifice. The Sacrifice was offered but once (and how often doth the Apostle rehearse that word *Once*?) by vertue of which, he was consecrated a Priest for ever. One Text more Hebr. 9. 12. *by his own blood he entered into the Holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us* ] *Ans.* But this blood was shed upon the cross, as the bullock and the ram, were first slain, and then their blood was carryed into the most holy place. The Sacrifice was without, the Application of it, was within the veil.

*Having obtained*] that is, formerly by his passion, and this Redemption thus obtained, *before* his Ascension, is called eternal, because it did abide and continue; so that there was no need of any second, any other Redemption, to follow after his Ascension.

"Q. 160. *Who is the head, and governour of this Church?*

Eph. 5. 23.

& 4. 5. 11.

12.

1 Cor. 12. 8.

"A. Jesus Christ himself is the only head and Lord of it, though he substitute others, for helps of government, and usefulness therein.

"Q. 161. *What be they?*

"A. For more inward growth and helpfulness, he hath given Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastours and Teachers. For outward order, Bishops or Elders and Deacons.

The Church is considered two ways. ( 1 ) Generally, consisting of all those who are joynd together in profession of Christianity and outward means of salvation. ( 2 ) more especially, consisting of those who are the best and principal, united to God in faith and love.

The former of these, is termed the Church visible, or, The *many called*: the other, is termed the Church invisible, or, The *few chosen*. The visible Church Catholick is the whole number of professing Christians thorowout the world, All that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ. This great body, or societie Ecclesiastical, containeth, and comprehendeth under it, as parts of it, all the parish Churches, all Classial, Diocesan, Provincial, and National Churches.

Of the Catholick invisible Church, Jesus Christ



is the onely Head and Lord: but he hath not substituted any other in his stead, *nisi vicarium spiritum sanctum*, unless the Holy Ghost. He hath indeed appointed officers in the Church visible; which officers have hitherto usually been divided into two sorts: first, Temporary & extraordinary; and secondly, Perpetual, and ordinary: which division, I think, it had been better to retain, than to give us a new one, which will not hold. For certainly the Apostles and Evangelists, did govern outwardly; and as certain it is, that the Bishops or Elders did teach, and feed the flock of God, for inward growth and helpfulness, Acts 20. 28. and 1 Pet. 5. 2.

It should seem that he means here, The Catholick Church visible; for such was the Church he described in Answ. to Qu. 158. "*A company of men called out of the world, and gathered into the worship of God.*" In this Church indeed our Saviour hath set officers, 1 Cor. 12. 28. in which whole chapter, the Apostle treateth of this kinde of Church: and it is true also that Jesus Christ may be said to be Head of this Church, in regard of the Graces of Edification, derived from him, for the Offices, Ministry, and Government of his Church, and in regard of the common benefits, and common gifts of a spiritual kinde: and thus is said v. 12. So also is Christ: where he meaneth, by Christ, this Body of the Catholick Church visible, of which he is in some sort the Head; and which is, in some sort his Body, and therefore called Christ. Though most properly he

is, as most commonly he is said to be, Head onely of that Body, whereof he is also the Saviour, *Eph.* 5. 23. which as his Spouse, or wife, shall live and reign with him for ever in heaven. And I have some reason to think, that our Catechist did not intend, in this place, so much to exclude the Bishop of Rome from being the spiritual head of the Christian world; as he did intend to exclude the Christian Magistrate, from ruling in a National, or any other particular Church.

Many years now past, that the King of *England* should be called *Head* of the Church, offended the parties of each extremitie: As those of our own were sorely troubled at it; so was it the point or sting of the charge against the *Bishop of Rochester*: & when *Hadr. Junius* was blasted from *Rome*, for that in the Dedication of his Greek *Lexicon* to *Edward* the VI. he called him Supreme *Head* of the Church of *England*; he pleaded for himself by letters, to the Court of Cardinals, that here with us, to clip the Kings Title, was almost as Capital, as to clip his Coin.

Howbeit, it was thought fit, in the beginning of the Queens Reign, whether to alter it, or explain it, by putting *Governour* in stead of *Head*. More, as I suppose, out of charitable condescension, then any necessity, or harm in the word; inasmuch as the word doth not note any internal efficacy or influence, but onely outward regiment; the title or term of [*LORD*] being as liable to exception, both the  
one

one and the other signifying no more then Superiority or pre-eminence: and a King or Queen regnant, might as well be called Head of these National Churches, as *Saul* was called by *Samuel*, Head of the tribes of Israel, 1 *Sam.* 15. 17. And that argument had with it more fallacy, then civility, which some formerly have used: *Omnes filii participes*, &c. All that are sons, are partakers of chastisement or Discipline: No true, or right-bred son that is *extra Disciplinam*: Therefore the Supreme Magistrate being a Christian, must be censurable as others are, because he is a son of the Church. But of what Church is he a son? of the Church Catholick he is: but of a particular or local Church, of this or that denomination, he is the Father, not a son: nor any member is he, but the Head. But I return, and attend upon our Catechist, with my suspicion to his

---

“ *Qu. 287, What is the Magistrates  
Dutie?*

“ *A. To execute judgement and ju-*

*Rom. 13.3,4,*

*Psal. 82.1,*

*2.3.4.*

*and 72.2.*

*Jer. 22.3.*

*1 Tim. 2.2.*

“ *stice impartially, protecting and encour-*

“ *aging them that do well, and punish-*

“ *ing the evil, and endeavouring to the*

“ *utmost of his power, the peace and*

“ *welfare of the people under him.*

Nothing is here of the power of the Magistrate in matters of Religion; *That*, is left out of his Commission

mission in this place. This being so great a Controversie at this present; and this so proper a place to have spoken to it, I think my negative argument will hold good; He sets down nothing of it here; therefore he beleeves it not; therefore he would not have it taught. One of his Texts in the margin, if he had marked it, speaks of Godliness, as well as Peace, 1 *Tim.* 2. 2. and since he hath thought good to alledge some texts out of the Old Testament, the proper place indeed where to inquire, what authority Ecclesiastical, Kings and Supreme Powers, have by Gods allowance; he might *there* have found evidence enough for that claim. But there hath scarce been known any man, that hath a teeming head, or goes big with new fanfies, and chooseth to leave the *common-road*, rather than *walk by vote*, that ever cared much for the Magistrates intermeddling in the Church, or matters of Faith, but is ready to cry out of Sacriledge, and encroachment upon Christs royal office; and scornfully to ask, if God be not able enough to defend his truth, but must be beholden to men. It is one of the many points wherein the old and new Donatists do meet. *Optatus lib. 3. Donatus solito furore succensus, in hac verba prorupit, Quid est Imperatori cum Ecclesia?* Let worldly Potentates look to the peace and welfare of their Realms, and let the people alone with their Religion.

But that I be not thought somewhat too quick, in gathering his denial of the Magistrates office *circa sacra*, from his omission of it in this Answer, or out

of the doubt raised out of his Answer to Qu. 160. I pray give me leave to call to minde the complaint that he makes to his Reader of the *Open Door*: For speaking of his own opinion, that is, the Universalists Doctrine; and of the Doctrine of the seeming Orthodox, and comparing them together, and likening them to *Tamars* Twins; he saith, "That his own Doctrine is indeed the elder, and came forth first, howsoever the world, like the midwife then, will needs have the other Doctrine the Eldest, and would have a scarlet threed upon it, establish it by a bloody Civil Sanction."] So may we know, what they are in his account, *Blond-thirsty* men, that think of settling their Religion by Authority: and yet it is the same man, who very lately, hath sent abroad a piece to tell the world, how much the Principles of the Orthodox have contributed to breeding of the Quakers: giving instance in six particulars; the last whereof is, *Their vein of Allegorizing*. If he be pleased to sweep his own house first, and begin to them in his example; it is somewhat probable, that they will do what they think fit to be done in that matter.

In the mean time, and untill they reform their vein of Allegorizing, I would, with all due respect, beseech him, to forbear his vein of scoffing; the which of the two, doth bring the greater prejudice to Religion, and doth more expose it to contempt of strangers: as when he calleth his brethren that dissent from him, *Ministers of the Gospel*, and *Ortho-*  
C *Phili-*

*Philistines*. For as they who please themselves in this humour, do more revive the memory of *Martin Marprelate*, with his scurrilities; so if they further add any invectives whatsoever in a critical season, against either Academy, or Clergy; they too much resemble in face and feature, that bastard brood, which yet now must be left at some others door, the lamentable and besotted persons above-named. They who set on foot new opinions, should do it modestly, if not timorously; or else with evident, and invincible proof, or demonstration. If his differing doctrines be indeed true, yet are they but new, yet are they forein, and, as I may say, intruders, to the constitution of our Church; and I hope he doth not think his adversaries to be so very weak, as to be flouted out of their possession.

And the same man it is (to give another instance that the same man is not always of the same minde) who in the Dedicatory before his *Caveat*, commendeth the Magistrates, or the Parliament, as having done worthily in the Act they made to prevent and punish blasphemy against God; and would have them stop the spreading of blasphemy against Christ (so he calleth the opinion of the seeming "orthodox") by the like provision. ] that which is one while a bloody Sanction, at another time he thinketh were a good deed. And whether the two Doctrines he speaketh of, be like the twins or no; he is but too like the father of the twins. he is very fervent in the case, till he perceives

it come too near himself, and his own partie;  
and then, as the persons varie', the case is al-  
tered.

*Joh. 1. 17.*

*Rom. 3. 20, 21.*

*Gal. 3. 19, 23-*

*24.*

"Qu. 167. *What call you the Law?*

"A. The doctrine given by *Moses*  
"for convincing of sin, and for a School-  
"master to tutour men to Christ.

"Qu. 168. *How is that Law, as gi-*  
"*ven by Moses divided?*

"A. Into Moral, Ceremonial, and  
"Judicial.

"Qu. 170. *Why did God give the*  
"*Moral Law?*

*Rom. 5. 20.*

*and 7. 7.*

*1 Cor. 3. 7.*

"A. To discover our sin, and cur-  
"sedness, that so we might the more  
"gladly embrace his son.

"Qu. 193. *Doth the Law yet continue*  
"*in its force?*

*Rom 6. 14.*

*and 10. 4.*

*Gal. 3. 25.*

*and 4. 4, 5.*

"A. Not to us, as to the Jews be-  
"fore Christs coming, because he is the  
"end of it, for righteousness to every  
"one that beleeveth, and hath by his  
"death redeemed us from under it.

"Qu. 196. *Is the Law then of use to*  
"*us now?*

*1 Tim. 1. 8.*

"A. Yes verily, if it be used law-  
"fully.

"Q. 197. *What is the lawfull use of it?*

C 2

"A. First

Rom. 3. 10.  
and 7. 7.  
1 Joh. 1. 8, 10.

"A. First to shew us what is sin, what  
"not, and so to convince us that we  
"have and do sin.

Rom. 5. 20, 21.  
1 Tim. 1. 8, 9,  
10, 11, 15.

"Secondly, to shew us the need we  
"have of Christ, and his Sacrifice, and  
"the cause to bless God for him.

Psal. 81. 9, 10.  
Rom. 8. 4.  
Jam. 2. 8, 9,  
10, 11.

"Thirdly, to shew us what we may  
"expect to be effected in us by the  
"grace of Christ, and how short we are  
"yet of it.

Rom. 3. 21.

"Fourthly, to witness to Christ, and  
"the grace in him.

2 Tim. 3. 14,  
15, 16, 17.

"Fifthly, it with all other Scriptures  
"is profitable to instruct, exhort, and  
"rebuke, &c.

"Qu. 290. *But oughtest thou not to  
"walk in the observation of the Ten Com-  
"mandments given by Moses?*

Rom. 8. 4. and  
13. 8, 9, 10.  
Gal. 3. 12,  
16, 18.

"A. In walking in the truth, as is  
"expressed, and so acting forth faith  
"and love, I do observe and keep al-  
"so those commandments, because in  
"walking after the Spirit, the righte-  
"ousness of the Law is, and shall be  
"fulfilled in me.

The brief Instruction to be gathered out of these  
Questions and Answers, is this: that the Law (that  
is, the Decalogue or ten Commandments) is of  
good use to bring us to Christ: but after that we be  
brought



brought to him ; then his Grace and Spirit be sufficient to direct us , so that we shall not much need the Law to be a Rule to us , at leastwise not regard it more than any other piece of Scripture.

To this I answer : We have hitherto in our Church been taught , and have learned , that the Decalogue is a Rule directing , and , a Law binding , even justified and regenerate Christians , though otherwise than it bindeth persons unregenerate.

*Artic. 7<sup>th</sup> of the 39.* Though the Law given by *Moses* , as touching Ceremonies do not binde Christian men , nor the civil precepts be of necessity to be received , yet *no Christian man whatsoever* is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral. No man , be he never so perfect a Christian. So the Articles of K. *Edw. 6.*

*Assemblies larger Catechisme.* The Moral Law is a Declaration of the will of God to mankinde , directing and binding every one , as well persons regenerate as others , to perfect and perpetual conformity and obedience thereunto.

*The Congregational Churches* in the Declaration of their Faith chap. 19. § 5, 6. The moral Law doth for ever binde all , as well justified persons as others to the obedience thereof , and is a Rule of life to true beleivers , as well as to others.

Thus have these taught , agreeably to the Catechismes and Christian Institutions of other reformed Churches , and writers. For whether they have made the ends and uses of the Moral Law , fewer,

or more; this hath still been one ; to be *Norma vivendi*, a Direction to order our life by. We thought, we had attained hitherto, to walk by the same Rule, and to be of one minde in this matter , whatsoever our other differences be ; And why this Authour should by teaching otherwise draw away disciples after him, let him see to it.

“ *Open door* , Preface. § It's injurious. [ Many “preachers in stead of Gospel-preaching , become “teachers of the Law , and jumble Law and Gospel “together: so that they neither preach Law nor “Gospel , but a mingle mangle of both , not “knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm, “talking of Duties to them, who want Principles “to perform them rightly ] by these words of his, it should seem, that the Law, must not be a Rule of Duties, to persons unconverted; so it must be no Rule at all, to any person whatsoever.

But I prove, that the ten Commandments , even *As given by Moses* , do oblige justified persons, to the Duties therein enjoyned. First , by Scripture. When Jesus Christ came , he confirmed the Law Moral, Matth. 5. 17. *Think not that I came to destroy the Law , I came to fulfill it.* Now that he meant the Law Moral , and that *As given by Moses*, appears by the following explication of the several Commandments, vers. 21. and 27, and 33. Matth. 22. v. 38, 39. He gave the sum of the first and second Table, calling them the first and second, the two great Commandments. Moses gave the Law , in

ten Precepts, and two Tables, and as so given, Christ confirmed it.

The Apostles also in their Epistles, exhort Christians to the Duties of the Law, *As given by Moses*; as well for manner, as matter. *Jam. 2. He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill.* And the Apostle *Paul, Ephes. 6.* calleth the fifth commandment, *The first commandment with promise*; the first, to wit, of the second Table. *Moses* gave the Law in ten precepts, and two Tables, and *as so given*, the Apostles do mention it, and urge the Duties of it.

Secondly, I prove by his own words, the Law to be a Rule to them that are in Christ. *Qu. and Answ. 197.* he saith, The first lawfull use of the Law, is, to shew us what is sin, and to convince us that we do sin; that is, that the regenerate do sin, as appears by his Text, *1 Joh. 1. 8. If we say we have no sin, &c.* How can the Law shew us that we do sin, but by being a rule against which we sin. Then next he alloweth the Moral Law, to be profitable with all other Scriptures, *to instruct, exhort, rebuke, &c.* indeed he doth not say, to direct, rule, binde, unless these be contained in his, &c. But if all other Scripture be a rule or Canon to us, in belief and life, why may not the Decalogue be so also? or what reason can be given, why the Decalogue written in the 20 Chapter of *Exodus*, should be of use above other Scripture to discover sin, and convince men, *Before Justification*; and yet after Justification, should be of no more use, then other Scriptures are, to rule and direct us in our

obedience? for plainly he teacheth in his Answ. to Qu. 197. (What is the lawfull use of the Law?) That for justified persons to use the Law as a Rule of obedience, *More* then other parts or places of Scripture, is to use it unlawfully.

“ Qu. 197. he saith, The Law sheweth what  
 “ we may expect to be effected in us, by the Grace  
 “ of Christ: and to that Qu. Oughtest thou not to  
 “ walk in the observation of the ten Command-  
 “ ments? the Answer is, In acting forth faith and  
 “ love we keep the Commandments, because in  
 “ walking after the Spirit, the righteousness of the  
 “ Law is fulfilled in us, *Rom. 8. 4*

I answer, First, that place now named, I beleeve, he misunderstandeth: for he taketh it to be meant of Sanctification, whereas, most probably it is meant of the righteousness of Justification, as is evident by conferring the fourth verse with the first, being both of the same import.

Secondly, Whatsoever the teacher intends to sow, the scholar may likely pick up here, a seed of Enthufiasme: for, if walking in the Spirit, and grace of Christ, and Acting forth faith and love, do bring a *Supersedeas* to the ten Commandments; then why not to all the Scripture as well? why may not the written word in general be thought needless to teach us our duties, or minde us of Comfort, Reproof, or Instruction? since this may be as well supplied in us, as the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us, by walking after the Spirit. But the Spirit of God

directs

directs us by the word, not discharging it, but causing us to understand, beleeve, embrace, and remember it.

Thirdly, whereas he produceth that text in the margin, *Rom. 13. Love is the fulfilling of the Law*, to prove that if we act forth love, we shall not much need to walk in the observation of the Decalogue. I shall now endeavour to shew his mistake.

To fulfill, is taken two ways; First, to perform perfectly: *To fulfill all righteousness, Matth. 3. To fulfill the Ministry, Coloss. 4.* And thus the Ceremonial Law of *Moses* was fulfilled, while the Priests, Levites, and people, performed the rites and Ordinances which were enjoined them. Secondly, to bring to an end, issue, or event. So Predictions and Prophecies, Types and Figures, are said to be fulfilled, when the things are come to pass, which those did foresignifie: *So the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, He was numbred with the transgressours*: and thus the Ceremonial Law of *Moses* was fulfilled, when Christ came and died for us, and put an end to it.

Now of these two significations of the word [*fulfill*] in this sentence [*Love fulfilleth the Law*] he seemeth to take it in the latter sense, as if it were said, The Spirit of God and Grace of Charity, hath made the Law out of Date, and put a final period to it; so that now it is not to be regarded any otherwise than the prophecies and shadows which have accomplishment in Christ: whereas the word *fulfill*,  
is

is not to be taken in this sense, but in the former. And yet if he doth take the word, *fulfill*, in the former sense, namely, *perfectly to perform*, as the word is taken there, ( understanding the while, perfection of parts, not of degrees ) then, he is mistaken in thinking that love fulfill the Law *per actus elicitos*, doing it self all that is required, whereas it doth not fulfill the Law otherwise than *per actus imperatos*, by setting others, other faculties and graces on work. The Sun giveth light to the world, *per actum elicatum*; it bringeth forth flowers and fruits, *per actum imperatum*. Love causeth us to be well and kindly affected, this is the own and proper work of it: but over and above, it layes a command upon us to be serviceable in several Duties. Love is not the fulfilling of the Law by elicit actions ( for fear and trust, are required moreover in the first Table; upright dealing and mercifulness in the second ) if it were, it should indeed bring some discharge to the Law; because it should contain in it self, all the several parcels of the Law: But because it doth fulfill the Law onely, by exciting us, or setting us on work, to do the several duties enjoyned, therefore it is needfull, nevertheless, that the Law should still abide in place and force, that we may know what the particulars are that God requireth of us, and that we may drive them out of obedience to his will, who commandeth these particulars to be done.

And certainly, Love is not more, a fulfilling of the Law, after that Christ is come, then it was before his coming.

coming: for to love God above all, was ever the sum of the first Table: and to love our Neighbour as our self, was always the sum of the second Table: and howsoever meant, the meaning was ever the same: and as much did charity put an end to the Decalogue, in the Old Testament, as it doth in the New.

One chief place of Scripture, by occasion of which, and by following the sound of it more than seeking after the sense of it, he is mis-led, and mis-leadeth others, is that which he quoteth to the Qu. 167. of the Law being a *schoolmaster to Christ*: which text, as some others also do, he mis-understands thorowout. For first by the Law, they mean the Moral, or ten Commandments; whereas indeed it meaneth the Law Ceremonial, chiefly, if not *onely*, which hath as much of the Gospel in it, as of the Law; the several rites and Ceremonies, being but *appendices Evangelii*, annexed to the Doctrine of the Gospel, then, though somewhat darkly, revealed. That the Apostle means this, and not the Law Moral, considered, as a Covenant of works, holding nothing for the present of a Saviour, appears by the scope of the Apostle to the Galatians; which is against them, that would have circumcision, and all the Ceremonies of *Moses* retained in the time of the Gospel, as necessary to our Justification in Christ: the very same opinion, that beginning at *Antioch*, the Apostles condemned at *Jerusalem*, *Acts 15*. The error of the beleeving Pharisees was not, that it was needfull to be circumcised, and to keep the ten Command-

mandments, but to be circumcised, and keep the Law of *Moses*, namely, that Law of *Moses*, which was of the same kinde with circumcision, which properly is the Law of *Moses*; the law *Moral*, being the Law of Nature, written in mans heart before, and by *Moses* ministry written out fair, in Tables of stone. Yet is it true that the Apostle speaketh in that Epistle against the Moral Law, so far as it was supposed to justifie us: but this he doth by way of argument against his adversaries; and not as if he made the cause of the Moral Law, and Ceremonial, all alike, in respect of retaining, or not retaining them; his way of arguing being, *à genere ad speciem negativé*. We are not justified by the Law, any Law whatsoever; therefore not by the Law Ceremonial.

And as our Authour mistakes the term [Law] here; so doth he also in the fourth lawfull use of the Law, which is to witness to Christ, quoting *Rom. 3. 21.* where it is said, that the Righteousness of Christ is witnessed by the Law and the Prophets. Where the Law, signifies the Books of the Law, not the ten Commandments. In the promise made to *Adam*, *Gen. 3.* to *Abraham*, *Gen. 12.* is testimony given to Christ and his grace, and in all those places where *Moses* wrote of him. The Law and the Prophets, being the same in that place, that *Moses* and the Prophets, *Acts 26. 22.* *Moses* in his five books wrote of Christ, so did the Prophets.

So for the Law. The word *Schoolmaster* mistaken, helpeth



helpeth to deceive them further: for upon hearing of that, they presently imagine great rigour, and hard usage to be intended: they think of nothing but stripes and scourges, and ruling with a wooden sceptre, as if he must needs be an *Orbilinus plagosus*, such a one as *Fr. Junius* met withall, that he complains of so much in his life: *Corpus suum exercitavit in corpore meo*: whereas the best authours that treat of teaching young scholars, as *Plutarch* and *Quintilian*, will not allow of striking of them. But be it as it may, for that: *Pedagogus*, howsoever through penury of words we be forced to turn it, is, *Formator morum*: such a one as was allowed and appointed to wait on great mens sons and heirs apparent, and to teach them how to behave themselves; and to frame their pliable and waxen age, to love of goodness, and practise of vertue, and detestation of vice, to fashion them betimes, so far as might be, for what they were to be another day. *Παιδαγωγὸν τρέφει*, so calls it *Constantine Manasses*, speaking of him that was Pedagogue to the Emperour *Augustus*: he did set him in right tune for his carriage, and made his behaviour congruous to himself, so great a Personage. Thus *Cyrus* had one who taught him before-hand, not to respect persons in matters of Justice, by reproving him for that he would have adjudged a coat, that was in question, not to the true owner, but to another whom it best fitted. And *Julian* in his *Misopogon*, checks the soft and effeminate people of *Antioch* by his own education, which was no way  
suit-

suitable to them: My Pedagogue, saith he, taught me, when I went into the Theatre, to look upon the ground; he would have him cast his eyes downward; not look up, upon the wanton and lascivious objects there presented to spectators.

His office likewise was, to accompany his young master, when he went abroad, or from home: Thus the famous *Cato*, the latter of the two, and the last of the Romanes, aged fourteen, when upon a visit he went to *Sylla*, being then at the height of his tyrannies; and saw the heads of the proscribed lying by heaps at the gate of his Palace, had a Pedagogue attending on him: and well it was he had so; for he talked so desperately upon their return, that (as my Authour saith, *semper postea adduxit excussum*) when ever after they were to go thither, care was taken that he might be searched lest the fierce youth should bear any thing about him, that might carry danger with it.

Yea, more than all this, the Pedagogue, did wait upon this his charge, when he went to school to learn letters and literature: *Barthius Advers.* 21. 1. *Pedagogi sequebantur pueros heriles literis operam duros*: and *Chrysostom* saith that the Pedagogue is not contrary to the Master (*πρὸ διδασκαλῆς*) but joyns with him in the work, and prepares the scholar to take the lessons that are to be taught him: Manifestly distinguishing him from a Schoolmaster, taken in the common and vulgar notion. So our Authour, with many others, mistakes the second term in, *lex Pedagogus noster*. Thirdly

Thirdly, they mistake as much, and as ill, the word *noster*; for, the [ *Nos* ] included in that Possessive, they take for particular Christians now living, and for such as shall hereafter live in the Church of God. Answer. to Qu. 167. *The law was given for "a Schoolmaster to tutor men to Christ"* ] men, indefinitely, and indifferently; meaning to humble unconverted Christians in a sense of their sins, till such time as they have attained peace and pardon, and then the Law hath done the work belonging to it; when they have attained faith, they are no longer under such a master. Whereas the Apostle doth not speak of particular persons, nor of the differing condition and estate of a man before his conversion and after; Although it be true that the work of the Law, is needfull to prepare for Justification through Christ Jesus, and a distressed conscience makes way for saving grace and spiritual comfort; yet that is not it, which the Apostle teacheth there; he maketh comparision (not between two several estates of the same person) but between two several people. He compareth the Judaical Church, and the Christian Church; and considering them both together, as a congregative body, or one entire person, he speaks of the several ages of that Body or Person. The Church of God under the old Testament was a Childe, or Heir in his minority: But the Christian Church in the new Testament, is as a man grown up, or of full age: as if he had thus said: We the Jews were under the law of Cere-

Ceremonies, and circumcision, but now we are no longer so. For neither doth he say, in the present time, The Law *is*, but it *was*, heretofore a Schoolmaster to Christ. And lastly, they mis-understand the word Christ, in this sentence, The Law is a Schoolmaster to *Christ*. For they take *Christ* here for a *Saviour*, at large: as *faith*, in the next verse Gal. 3. 25. for *justifying* faith, or faith in a Saviour: whereas *Christ* here signifyeth, *Christ revealed*, or manifested in the times of the Gospel, as chap. 2. verse 4. *Our libertie which we have in Christ Jesus*, and chap. 6. vers. 15. *in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth, nor uncircumcision*: in the old Testament, it was something, now it is nothing. And *Faith* in the place now named, [*after that faith is come*] meaneth *Tempus Evangelii*, the Gospel, or Doctrine of *Christ* exhibited in the flesh.

Whereas therefore, they take the meaning of these two verses to be this; (Gal. 3. 24, 25.) The Moral Law, shewing what God requireth of us, and thus what the curse is, that is due to the breach of it; it driveth us to Christ, and forceth us to seek a Saviour: but after we be justified by faith in Christ, we are no longer under that Law; the Apostle saith not so: but this it amounteth to, which he saith: The Ceremonial law under which ye would still continue, was but to train you up, and prepare you for the full manifestation of Christ incarnate, and now when Christ Jesus is come, the Church of God hath no more need of shadows and Ceremonies: their

their work is done, and we are freed from being under them any longer.

That this is the meaning of the words, and that *S. Paul*, by being under a Schoolmaster, meaneth not, Being under the spirit of bondage, (as some call it) and that he speaks not of Christian liberty, from the curse of the Moral Law, but onely from the burden of the Ceremonial law, is evident by that which follows in the fourth chapter. For they who were under this Schoolmaster, whosoever they were, were the mean while heirs or children, not servants, although in some regards not much distant from servants. A servant knoweth not what his lord doth: A servant knoweth as much as the heir doth, before he be of age, being kept in ignorance, or little acquainted with his fathers minde, yet he knoweth that his father loves him, and will make of him inheritour of his estate. But they who are under the malediction of the Moral Law, know not and thus much, know not so much as this comes to; neither are they heirs, or lords of all.

The Jews, whiles under this Schoolmaster, were we children; after Christ came, they were sons: they were sons before, but how? *naturâ, non libertate*. They were in their minority, and under tutelage. They were made partakers of Christ, but not of Christ fully manifested. So that the Apostle maketh opposition, betwixt these two, *Children*, and *Sons*, by Gods understanding *adulti*, men of age. The difference of which words in the Apostles text chap. 3.

D

vers. 26.

vers. 26. and chap. 4. vers. 1, 6. is not observed accordingly in some translations; though in some others it be: and among the former, Ours is. *Clemens Alex. Pedag. 1. 6.* υἱὸς καλῶν ἀπένδρῳσιν, when he called them *Sons*, he meant they were men, to distinguish them from infants or little ones under the Law. So then there is nothing spoken by S<sup>r</sup> Paul here, that giveth countenance to them that make void the force of the Decalogue to beleiving Christians: and though our Authour in expounding of the words, goes not alone; yet approved writers never go so far, as to teach that when a Christian hath attained faith, he is no longer under the Regulation of the Moral Law, though they teach he is no longer under the malediction of it.

---

“Qu. 216. *What is the Lords Say per?*

“A. An ordinance of Christ,  
 “which when he was about to suffer  
 “he appointed the Professours of his  
 “name to take and break bread, and  
 “eat it, and drink of one cup together  
 “therein representing and sealing to  
 “further grace to be met with in him

*Professours* ] I do agree with him thus far, that our Saviour appointed *Professours* to eat; that the Profession of Christian faith, doth warrant

both the Minister to deliver, and the Communicants to receive, the Eucharist, if they be not under Church-censures, though they be not as yet endued with justifying faith, or saving grace; Otherwise, if competency of knowledge, and freedom from scandal, without convincing signes of regeneration, be not sufficient; it would follow, that the Sacraments should be, in their own nature intended, as badges or marks of difference, not betwixt Christians and Pagans, a Church, and no Church; but betwixt hypocrites and true beleivers: the converted, and the non-converted: and should serve to separate the Church visible, from the Invisible: and the Lords Supper should be as a fan to sever the wheat from the chaff: which to do is a work belonging to the last day, both generally, and respectively.

But that *Professours* should be appointed to break bread, this hath with it some umbrage and suspicion. For it doth seem to authorize, any Christian, though unordained, to administer that Sacrament. And this suspicion is increased, because in sixteen Questions and Answers, containing the Doctrine of the Sacraments, this is all the mention he maketh of any Minister, and this upon the matter is no mention at all. *To take, and eat*, belongeth to each communicant; but to *take and break*, is an action Ministerial; and by the Evangelists relating, and the apostle repeating the Institution, constantly spoken of our Saviour *Christ* onely.

The Council of Trent framed a curse against those

those who held that all Christians have power to administer the Sacraments: but the Protestants answered, that they were not concerned in it. It might touch the Anabaptists, whom they opposed, as much as who most: And *Bellarmino* rehearseth *Calvins* words, relating to that Curse or Canon; *Nemo sanus Christianos omnes, &c.* that is, no man that is in his right senses, doth think, all Christians have power alike in administering the Sacraments; and concludeth thus, *itaque cum Calvino nulla nobis hoc loco controversia est*: who should administer the Eucharist, in this we differ not, saith he, though we be not fully agreed, who should administer Baptisme.

Therefore, whether it were carelessly done, or purposely, it was ill done, to teach that Christ appointed *Professours* of his name, (Christians at large) to *take and break bread*, (to administer the Lords Supper) a doctrine disclaimed by all Christians, but Anabaptists.

“Qu. 265. *When shall the dead be*

1 *Thess.* 4. 15. “*raised?*

1 *Cor.* 15. 23, “*A. They that are Christs at his*

24.

*Rev.* 20. 4, 5. “*coming, and the rest afterward.*

There is no ground for this answer in any of the Texts quoted, there is some colour indeed out of the first of them, if you take it alone; & dd. separate from



from the verse foregoing, and the verse following ;  
The Dead in Christ shall rise first : the Apostle doth  
not mean that those who are none of Christs shall  
be raised next, or in the second place , for he com-  
pareth not together the raising of these two sorts,  
namely, the Dead that are Christs, and the Dead  
that are none of his; but he compareth, of those  
that belong to Christ; the dead, and the living : or  
the raising of the dead, and the changing of the li-  
ving : so it followeth : *Then we which are alive and  
remain, shall be caught up together with them, &c.* But  
the other two have not so much as any colour at all:  
for that in 1 Cor. 15. speaketh not of the Resurre-  
ction of the unjust : and that in Revel. 20. speaketh  
not of the last Resurrection.

Now I come to the Quest. and Answers that  
look toward the *Cinque-Points*, which I have reser-  
ved to consider together, howsoever scattered tho-  
rowout the Catechisme.

---

“ Qu. 57. *Is there then no escape from  
this misery ?*

“ A. Yes, the same God that crea-  
“ ted us at the first, had Love, Power,  
“ and Wisdome enough to help us , and  
“ hath devised and provided help for us.

This Answer is true, and without exception ; save  
that here seemeth to be a reasoning, from the power

of God, to his act: he *hath* done it, because he *can* do it, which is not safe.

And considering the usual argumentations of this sort of men, I do suspect herein, a Dark, but Dangerous insinuation, That God hath done for us all that he could do, and that Man thinks fit he should do. He that speaks but darkly, is oftentimes best understood, and made out by his companion; and that shall now be the Authour of *Ἐπιπομπή*, p. 33. How dwelleth the love of Man in God, if having means and opportunity in his hand to relieve the whole world of mankind, without the least inconvenience to himself, he yet shall suffer the far greatest part of them to perish, without intending relief to them.]

Which conceit, when it is once taken in, and while it is made use of, though not improved, doth unavoidably expose men to *Epicurcan Atheisme*: for when they shall see in those things, wherein we walk by sight, and not by faith, as we do in the mysteries of faith; when they shall observe in the world, that God Almighty *doth not* do all the good that we may well think he can do; and that he *doth not* free the creature from the servitude that it yet groans under, and *doth not* put forth his helping hand, without the least inconvenience to himself, for the relief of man and beast, but suffers evils and miseries to continue and abound; It must needs follow, that being persuaded with this principle, they should hereupon be tempted, to doubt of, perhaps to denie, either God

himself, or his Providence, or his Power, or Wisdom, or Goodness. But the Prophet *Malachi* saith, God had *residuum spiritus*, yet he made but one: so hath he infinite treasures of power and goodness: yet it pleased him to deal according to his infinite wisdom, and not according to our thoughts. This is but a chip of the old *Marcion*: and when time shall come, God will be cleared and justified, in his sayings, and in his doings, and all his holy attributes, with little thank to the censorious.

---

“Qu. 93. *For whom was his Death a satisfactory ransom?*”

“A. For all.

“Qu. 94. *How doth that appear?*”

“A. The Scriptures plainly affirm it so, telling us, that he died and gave himself a ransom for all, tasted Death for every one.

The controversie is not, Whether Christ did die for all, or no: but how, and in what sense, it is so said. There be many places of holy Scripture, and many arguments, not easily solved; because, as I think, insoluble; which are brought to prove, that Jesus Christ did suffer death for all men: But when it is also said, that he died for his sheep; and for his Church; and that for whom God delivered up his son, to them he giveth all things; and when his

D 4

Death,

Death, Resurrection, and Intercession, do as in a chain, one draw the other, *Rom. 8.* And when it is certain, that God doth not give all things to all men, as namely, not Faith and Repentance; we are of necessity put upon it to distinguish: which we do so as to satisfie our selves; yet finding withall, that Contention is fed with a fire that is unquenchable.

We beleeve, as our Church hath made profession, and taught us, that the Son of God did offer a full, perfect, and sufficient oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and that he died for every man. And although notice of this be not given to every man, or all the world; yet may it be given, and truly declared to them.

Such love did God bear to Humane nature, or all mankind, more than to the lapsed Angels; that there was, and is a possibility for every man whatsoever to be saved, though he do not perform the Law, or Covenant of works. Gods justice is so far satisfied, that way is made for mercy, pardon, and favour. Nevertheless, for the actual participation of benefit by Christs Death, and application to each particular person, there is more to be done, than what is done by Christ for all the world. The fruit of his passion, as to life eternal, is derived onely to his body mystical, to such as are more nearly united to him, than by the common Relation, or kin, or claim of humane nature, which he took upon him, and for which he suffered. And although by his blood he obtained, as well Universal, as eternal Redemption.

demption; yet by Faith in his blood are we justified. And he who is said to be the Saviour of *all men*, is said also to be the Saviour of *his Body*; that is, of such as partake of his Spirit, and are subject to him, and joynted to him, as the parts of the Body are to the Head: So all men are not.

In this Nation at some especiall times, comes forth a General Pardon: in which case though we set aside the Exceptions, or the excepted; Those persons to whom it is really and truly intended, must sue out their pardon: otherwise, they may be supposed not to accept of it. And if then, any shall urge the Term, and Title of the General Pardon, and insist, without end upon this, That a pardon it is, and such a pardon as is general to all the people, without taking notice of any thing else further to be done; he that hath but small skill, can easily see, how weak such kinde of reasoning is.

Now whereas Faith is Gods gift, and he bestoweth his Spirit where he will, and man cannot beleeve of himself, nor perform the condition required; here beginneth the first overture of that secret difference that is betwixt man and man: and here first openeth it self, the great mystery of *Election*, in that the Ransom, or Satisfaction which God hath accepted, as general, and sufficient for all men, that *whosoever beleeveth should not perish*; doth not actually, and efficaciously, profit all men to life eternal, because to all men it is not given, to beleeve and perform the condition.

Whereas

Whereas others think best to distinguish here, the universal particle *All*; all, both Jews and Gentiles: or *all*, that is, the several kinds, or estates of men: or *all*, that is, all the Elect. I do now distinguish the Intentional particle, *For*: which denoteth the end, or intention; and sometimes moreover the effect of the Intention.

The death of Christ was *for all*, but not *for all alike*, or in the same manner, or with the like issue & event. He gave himself, and suffered sufficiently, with a *general Intention for all*; but efficaciously, with a *special Intention, for some onely*.

When we say *sufficiently*, we do not mean a mere or bare sufficiency, as if there were onely price and worth enough in Christs blood, to redeem all. As a rich man may have money enough in his chest, to relieve all the poor in the Town: But we mean a sufficiency with promise and proffer of benefit for all, yet not without a condition to be performed: As when a rich man doth give such a sum of money, to be by dole distributed to all the poor of that Town where he liveth: provided that they orderly attend at such a time and place to receive it. The Gift is intended for them all. But some it may be, had no notice of it: and perhaps some others have no minde to take it. Yet were the alms intended for them all, and to each of them who did absent themselves, may be truly said, Had you waited as was appointed you had received your dole. But so it cannot truly be said to such poor, as live in distant places, because

it was not intended, nor provided for them.

There is no possibility for Satan and his angels to be saved by the death of Christ, not onely because their nature was not assumed, but because Christs death in the purpose of God, was not ordained for them, as it was for mankind. This Proposition therefore [*If Satan beleeve, he shall be saved*] is not true, because Christ died not for him. But this Proposition [*If Judas Iscariot beleeve, he shall be saved, was true, because Christ died for him.*]

A favourite may procure a place at Court, for his friend in the Countrey; who nevertheless doth choose to live retiredly, and in the shadow, rather then in the view and glory of the world: the preferment in the mean time being ready for him, intended for him, and proffered him.

And that in this sense, our Blessed Saviour did suffer death for *all men*: as our Church hath framed the Answer; *Jesus Christ redeemed me and all mankind*, may be proved out of those words, 1 John 3. 23. *This is his Commandment, that we should beleeve in the name of his Son.* There is not onely a *Command* or *Commission* to the Apostles, to preach the Gospel to every Creature: But a *Command* also to every one that hears it, to beleeve it. Now, first, God doth not command any thing to be beleeved that is not true: and whosoever beleeveeth in the Son of God, must beleeve, this at the least, that he died for him; therefore God commandeth every man that heareth the Gospel, to beleeve that the Son of God died

died for him. Now whatsoever I beleeve, is not therefore true because I beleeve it; but it must be true before it be beleaved: so for all those that are commanded to beleeve, did Christ suffer Death, and offer Sacrifice.

And if any man shall hold on the contrary, that Faith doth not consist in beleeving this or that proposition, as, Jesus Christ gave himself for me; but in laying hold on, and apprehending and receiving Christ a Saviour, and that this is the right object of that kind of Faith, which is given in command to every one that heareth the Gospel; Then I argue, secondly thus: God doth not command any thing that is impossible. I mean not, that is impossible to such a person as now he is, and at such a time; but that is impossible in it self to be done. But now it is a thing not possible or any way feisable, for me to lay hold on Christ a Saviour, unless he be ordained and appointed a Saviour for me: and this cannot be, but by Gods appointment and institution, setting him forth to be a common Sacrifice and propitiation: thus it is in life spiritual, even as in corporal life, and the course of nature, it is impossible to be fed and nourished by a stone, because it never was ordained of God for food. Therefore Jesus Christ did give himself a Sacrifice for all men that hear the Gospel: and as for them who never heard of him, he offered Sacrifice for their sins also: and whosoever shall go and tell them so, shall tell them but the truth. Although, untill they hear it, they do not sin, in not beleeving



believing it; as they do, who hear, and believe not. So much for the general intention, and ordination of Christs Death for all men.

But as there is this general Redemption, by means of that one Sacrifice for all men; so there is proper to those who are chosen to life, A special Redemption; which, as it proceeds from Election, Eph. 1. 4. so it consists in actual forgiveness of sins, v. 7. *in whom we have Redemption, the forgiveness of sins.* All men are no where said to be *elect*d, All men are no where said to be *forgiven*. So some Redemption belongs to all; but, not every kinde of Redemption.

And that the intention of benefit by Christs Passion, was not alike to all, on his part; but more to some than to others; appeareth hence, that there was not the like application of it, made by him to all. He who offered himself a Sacrifice for the sins of all men, yet did pray for some onely, Joh. 17. 9. And God who gave his son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, did absolutely intend, that the benefit of that promise should infallibly take place, in some, by removing that infidelity, which might have hindred them, and by giving faith which enabled them, to perform the condition, and lay hold on the promise, for want of which faith, others are lost. If in time, and in execution, he dealeth not alike the fruit of Christs Death to all men; then may we safely gather, that his purpose and intention, touching the fruit of Christs Death

was

was not alike to all men. *Executio est speculum De-creti*, we may safely behold and view, Gods purpose and determination, in what he doth in time effect and bring to pass.

And if any man shall now murmur within himself and say: I know not whether I be of that selected number, for whom Christs Death was intended to be actually & every way efficacious; nor whether Gods love and good will be as much to me, as it is to any other, and shall thereupon neglect the duties of Gods law, and the means of his own eternal safety, giving ear to the whispers of some false teachers, by whom he is encouraged so to do, or at leastwise excused for so doing, rather than listening to the grave and wholesome advice, of our Church-Articles; which is, To receive Gods promises, in such wise, as they be generally set forth in holy Scriptures; I shall onely desire him to call to minde that saying of *Moses Deut. 29. Secret things belong to the Lord our God, but things revealed belong to us.* In which words the Man of God setteth bounds to our knowledge, and to our search, as once he did to the people at the foot of the mount, that they might know their distance and keep it, and not at their utmost peril, break thorow, and gaze. And whosoever he be that shall refuse, to entertain and embrace points of belief, and the Doctrine of godliness fully revealed; and in the mean time busily intermeddle with secrets reserved; shall add to disobedience, the sacriledge of curiosity, and may fear that God will see

set his face against him, that shall dare to crosse and thwart, in such a manner, so severe an Edict made known and published.

Having delivered, by way of Question and Answer, that Christs Death was a satisfactory Ransome for all, and that nevertheless the greatest part go to destruction, he proceedeth.

*“Qu. 96. How can that be if Christs Death was a satisfactory Ransome for their sins, what shall they perish for?”*

*Joh. 3. 19.*

*Prov. 1. 24, 25.*

*Joh. 5. 40.*

*“A. Because he here through coming a light into the world, they love darkness rather, sin against his mediation, and refuse to be saved by him.”*

*“Qu. 97. Was not his Death the Ransome for these sins too?”*

*Rom. 5. 12, 18.*

*1 Cor. 5. 21.*

*“A. Properly and absolutely it was not, so as to make the forgiveness of them due debt, but onely for the sin of Adam, and the sins that it brought upon us considered as before and without Christs coming, which was all the sin we were bound over to death by, and must have perished in, had not God sent him to die for us.”*

*“Qu. 98. Must all they then that sin against*

" against his Mediation and the light and

" Grace thereby received, perish?

*Psal.* 68. 21.

*Prov.* 1. 22, 23.

*Ezek.* 18. 22.

and 33. 16.

*Act.* 13. 39.

" A. All that persist finally so to sin

" shall, but not all that at any time sin

" such sins, for he can forgive them al-

" so, and doth, to them that repent of

" them.

" Qu. 99. How can that be?

*Rom.* 5. 16, 17.

" A. Very well, because of the su-

" perabundancy of the worth and merit

" of his Death beyond the demerit of

" Adams sin, and of all the sins that

" thereby he found upon us.

The Brief of these Instructions is this:

All sin, and sins whatsoever, Original and Actual, of all men whomsoever, whether they repent of those sins or not, do obtain at Gods hand forgiveness as due debt, by means and vertue of Christs satisfaction; those sins excepted which are against the Gospel, and Christ coming a light into the world, yet these may be forgiven too, if they be repented of, because Christs gift for Justification superaboundeth for the forgiveness of more sins than Adams transgression brought upon us.

An accusation that is found to be false, reboundeth with greater force upon him that brought it: I will not charge the Catechist with this opinion now set down by me. It is charitable to think, he wrote here, he could not well tell what: but I do charge  
his

his words, his Questions and Answers with the collection abovesaid.

The worst of Pagans, may claim, it seems, as due debt, the pardon of their most atrocious crimes, because these are sins, that Adams sin brought upon them, Answ. 97. that Christ found upon them, Answ. 99] Original sin produceth, or bringeth upon us, all actual sins, as the root produceth the fruit. The greatest sins of all, those by the Apostle enumerated, Rom. 1. Sins against the law of nature, sins ripe to judgement, filled in measure and running over: such as for number, and greatness, and multiplication, follow one another till they reach to heaven, Revel. 18.5. these all, if they be but against the Law of nature, and not against the Grace of Christ, claim pardon, as due debt, first, without asking pardon, (it is but just, and just it is, to give, or pay due debt, though it be not demanded.) secondly without *Repentance*: indeed for sins against Christs Mediation, there is a Condition or Proviso, that they be repented of: but none at all for other sins, they are forgiven absolutely, without further suit or service. So that according to this Doctrine, it is far better, to hold of the first Adam, as our Head, and as our Root, than to hold of the second, or to hear of him: For, by the first Adam, and the privilege procured for him, we are clear of our old debts, and by means of the second, we contract new.

If any shall say, to save his words, from this  
E worse

worse than heathenish Divinity, that whereas he speaks *Answ. 96.* of sinning against Christs Mediation, he may haply mean that Mediation, which the works of Creation do speak, according to his Instructions *Qu.* and *Answ. 152, 153.* and that thus all hainous sins against the law of nature, may be said to be against the Grace of Christ; and thus the Sodomites might be said, to sin against Christs Mediation, obscurely intimated in that God gave them a pleasant countrey, and caused the sun to rise upon their city: To this I *answer*, He cannot mean the Mediation and Grace made known by the creatures, but must mean the Mediation made known by Christs Incarnation, because *Answ. 97.* he saith Christs Death was a Ransome for those sins that were upon us *Before*, and considered *Without*, Christs coming a light into the world: now I think Christs coming, cannot possibly be understood otherwise than of his coming in the flesh; and *Answ. 96.* *He here-through coming*: that is, by his Death, as plain by the Question. And howsoever, there were no sins before God did speak his goodness, in the heavens and works of Creation, or that can be considered without Christs Mediation supposed to be shown in temporal blessings. So that the sense which the words yeeld, cannot be, but as is said.

There be some opinions, if they be fit to be rehearsed in Christian ears; need nothing but the mere rehearsal for their confutation, for their detestation, I love not to rake in this worse than Pelagian

gian puddle, where the Preaching of the Gospel is so far from being made a benefit or a blessing upon a People, that Christians, and none but Christians thorowout the world, are capable of being cast away or perishing. But for his Pelagian Crambe (I call it so, as by him urged) of the Universal particle [ *All* ] he hath alledged two texts. One, Rom. 5. 18. *By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men, to justification:* the other 1 Cor. 15. 22. (for I take that verse and not the 21 to be meant, as being the parallel place). *In Christ shall all be made alive:* concerning this last place, whether it be the 21, or 22, or both, somewhat is to be premised, because it may be diversly understood. I think it is to be taken of a glorious vivification, or Resurrection to life: for this properly is a Resurrection: and of this onely is treated, in that whole chapter; for the wicked or cast-aways shall arise, not by efficacy of Christ the Saviour, but by sentence of God the Judge: for being by him, sentenced to Death, they must come forth of prison to be led to execution: That Resurrection, which is a priviledge of the holy Catholick Church, in the Apostles Creed: That which is spoken of Luke 20. 36. *children of God, being children of the Resurrection;* is that spoken of in this chapter: also in 1 Theff. 4. the comfort of Gods people being intended both there, and here.

Now for the Texts brought to prove, the forgiveness of mens sins, that were brought upon

them by Adam, to be *Due Debt*, I answer, he might have looked within a few verses of his second text, and thus have read: [ *But when he saith all things, it is manifest that he is excepted, &c.* ] In some universals, there be manifest exceptions: and in every universal, there is restriction to the subject matter, or that which for the present is spoken of: he chargeth us somewhere, with *broad denial* of Scripture-sayings. Not so: but it is the *Denial of the broad sense* of some Scripture-sayings, this we own and acknowledge. All things that are said in Scripture, or any where else, are not to be taken in the full latitude. *Divinâ gratiâ opus est*, saith *S<sup>t</sup> Chrysostom*. *Hom. in Joann. 39.* *νὴ ἁλοῦς ῥήματα ἰνίσταμιν: ita hæretici in errorem incidunt*; We had need pray that God would give us grace, not to stand too much upon the bare words, for so come hereticks to fall into their errors. Gods word is written for them that are awake, and have understanding, and make use of it, when they read, But for those two places he needed not to have looked far, to finde a limitation of the universal particle *all*: for *Rom. 5. 18.* it is limited in the very next verse, vers. 17. *recipientibus*, to them that receive the abundance of Grace. And in *1 Cor. 15. 22.* it is limited in the very next verse 23. to those *that are Christs*. *Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christs.*

And as for the difference he hath given us, between the sins against the Law of Nature, and the sins against the light of the Gospel, that Christs  
Death



Death should be properly, for the pardon of the former, and not of the other, I can no where finde; nor do I acknowledge any ground for it. S<sup>t</sup> *John* telleth us, that the blood of *Jesus Christ*, cleanseth us from *all* sin: and the Apostle *Paul*, who persecuted *Christ*, when he was come a light into the world, was nevertheless made a *pattern* to those that should afterwards believe, 1 Tim. 1. 16. if he who fiercely persecuted *Jesus Christ*, be made of God a Pattern and Precedent to others, of the virtue of his Death; surely then was Christs Death as proper for him, as for others; and as proper for them that sin as he did, as for him. They who never heard of *Christ* are commanded to repent; Act. 17. 30. as well as they who crucified the Lord of life, Act. 2. 38. *Christ* died for both, and both must repent, and neither of them can claim forgiveness of *due debt*, without Repentance.

M *H.* talks much, and unseasonably enough of the extent of Christs Death; and makes it almost an unpardonable crime, to limit it to Gods elect, or them that shall be saved: But who ever made so odious a restraint of it, as he hath here made? as if it were not properly and absolutely a Ransome, for any person this day in *England*, or yet in all Christendome; for all the sins of Christians must needs be against the light of the Gospel, *their* sins cannot be considered *before*, or *without* Christs coming. One text he alledgeth, but depraveth it, that it may serve his purpose, Rom. 5. 16, 17. *The judgement*

was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences to justification, therefore Christs Death was properly for those sins he found upon us, for those sins, which were brought upon us by Adam; but for no other sins properly and absolutely. One-ly out of the superabundance of Christs Grace, upon our Repentance, shall be forgiven more sins than ever came by Adam: as if infidelity, and sinning against the light of the Gospel, and refusing to be saved, and love of darkness more than light; were not found upon us by means of Adams transgression. And secondly I answer, the meaning of the Apostles words is this. The first Adams sin was but one: but when the second Adam cometh, doth he onely take away that one sin? not so: he doth set us free from many offences; that is, from the multitude of offences or actual sins committed by us: Now S. Paul doth not distinguish of those many offences, (and why should any other then?) but would be taken to mean all kinde of offences, whether considered before, and without Christs coming; or else proceeding out of love of darkness, when his coming is made known. From all kinde of actual sins, properly and intentionally, though not absolutely without Repentance, Christs off-spring or children are discharged, through Christ their Head and Father.

Eph. 1. 4, 5, 10.

Isai. 42. 1.

1 Pet. 2. 4, 9.

Isai. 53. 10, 11.

Col. 1. 19. and

2. 9.

Gal. 3. 7, 9.

26, 27, 28, 29.

Eph. 1. 5, 6.

“Qu. 136. *What is Election?*

“A. A gracious act of Gods free  
 “will, in which he, before the founda-  
 “tions of the world, chose (or purpo-  
 “sed to choose) the man Jesus Christ  
 “into unity with the eternal Word, and  
 “and so to be his holy One, the trea-  
 “sury of all his blessing, and worker  
 “out of all his pleasure, and in him all  
 “the seed springing forth of the tra-  
 “vail of his soul to holiness and blessing  
 “with him, for the praise of his own  
 “grace.

The question is propounded concerning Election: the main or chief part of the answer is returned concerning the Incarnation of the son of God; or the uniting the man Jesus Christ with the eternal word. A bold Innovation, Confusion, and Elusion.

*Innovation*, so will I think it, and call it, untill I can finde who hath gone before him, of the Papists, Protestants, of the Remonstrants, Lutherans, or any other in this definition.

*Confusion*, in that he hath confounded, and in a manner, made all one, those things which are of a quite differing and disparate nature.

*Elusion*, for what greater abuse or mockage can by any man be put upon his friend, than to stretch forth his hand and hold out one thing, and when he

should take it, to give him quite another? Should any man take such libertie as to imitate him, he might reduce not the Incarnation onely, but most of the Articles of the Creed, and most of the works of God, to Election. And even this great Mystery of the Incarnation, which appertained not to this place, he hath expressed very untowardly. Had he been so wary as to keep himself to the *Athanasian Creed*, he had not used those words of God choosing the man Jesus Christ to be united with the word, but of Christ assuming the manhood into God, or to the Eternal word. The Man denotes the Person, The Manhood denotes the Nature. Jesus Christ did not assume mans Person, but mans Nature. The Humanity was framed, and united, both, at the same instant of time: the making & taking to himself our flesh, was but one Act. If the Son of God had taken to himself, a man already made and perfected, and having personal subsistence; then there should have been two persons in Christ, whereas there is but one person consisting of two natures; as our Authour hath soundly and fully delivered, above, in the Answer to the 68 Question. So that here, wresting that to his purpose which did not belong to it, to the intent he might be thought, not to deny all personal Election, but that God chooseth One man, particularly and definitely; he hath unwittingly dashed himself upon *Nestorianisme*.

And if any man shall say now, That I deal not fairly,

fairly, thus to aggravate a mistake of this kinde, where no harm is intended, but all is meant well, as I am willing to acknowledge out of his own words elsewhere, I shall alledge that for my self, which is to be found, if I mistake not, and is observed in the Civil Law, and as I think, in our Laws too: *Res illi- cita & jocularia, casum reddit atrociozem*. He that being seriously employed in his honest calling, or any lawfull action, doth by way of mis-adventure procure some danger or damage, to his neighbours goods, or life, or limb; shall not incur the same guilt, nor draw upon himself the same punishment, that another shall, who doth the very same harm, whiles he is either in sport and idle, or else bent upon some other mischief. Our Authour was meditating a Mock-answer to a serious Question, and studying how to elude, and evade, and make void, Gods Election of particular persons: to that purpose wresting both the word of God, and the Analogy of Faith: a bad intent, an ill designe and work; in prosecution of which, while he stumbled upon an old condemned heresie, the blame of what befell him, may with right and reason rest upon him.

After the prime and principal part of his Answer, followeth something touching what is mentioned in the Question; (the other I called a Mock-Answer) but in such a manner, as if he were afraid of being guilty of following his Elders Tradition, or of delivering what he hath received of our Church, affect-  
ing

ing to be wiser then his Teachers, who yet have delivered nothing, but what they have received of Christ and his Apostles. This may appear by these particulars.

*First*, whereas he saith, [ *chose, or purposed to choose* ] I do mis-doubt his disjunctive, as tending to overthrow all precedaneous Election. In Copulatives, both must be true, to make the proposition true: but in Disjunctives, it is enough, if one of them hold true; and it is likely that with some of his partners, he will betake himself, if need be, to the sole *purpose* or *intention* to Elect. So abundantly cautelous he is, that there should be no Election whatsoever, *ab aeterno*, though it be but such, as one would think, might very safely have been yeilded *Open door*, Preface. " [ That any uncalled, are ever called Elect, I can no where finde in Scripture, ] In what terms would he have it delivered that he might say, Now have I found it? There are Elect from the beginning; Elect before the foundation of the world: therefore as yet uncalled: he may finde Election placed before Vocation, in that chain *Rom. 8.*

When as they hear the Elect spoken of, they will tell you, that *Elect* doth not signifie choten, but choise, or Excellent. Tell them, it is *Electos quos elegit*: the Elect whom he hath chosen: they will say, That God chooseth them then, when they beleeve. Tell them, that God doth choose his Elect before the foundation of the world: that is, say they

He did purpose to choose them when they come to beleeve. But so were they justified, and glorified before the world was: so was the world at an end, before the foundation was laid. Thus no words of holy Writ, how plain soever, can secure the truth against the perverse wits, of such as are corrupt and self-willed.

*Secondly*, he teacheth here, That in the Doctrine of Election we must begin with Christ: and there he given abroad certain verses of his, which tender this as a Main-principle to be born in minde, That Christ fore-known is the foundation of all, and the not knowing, or learning of this, breedeth many errors: these texts subjoynd, *Isa.* 28. 16. *1 Cor.* 3. 11. Agreeably whereunto it hath been taught by others of his way, and by such as led the way to others. That Gods first Decree, is, *De mittendo Christum*, to send his son into the world. *Ans<sup>w</sup>*. There must be something of necessity, precedent to the Mission or Manifestation of Christ, or to Gods pre-ordination to send and manifest him. I know that in God, who is eternity it self, all things are together, nothing properly going before or following. And to us, as we now are, it is a hard matter to know how to speak or think of Gods manner of acting or proceeding in his Decrees: Nevertheless, as when he speaketh unto us in holy Scripture, he is pleased to condescend to our capacities, and to borrow his manner of speech from our custome and usage, to the intent he may be understood of us; So he giveth us leave

leave, when we speak of him, to use our own expressions, so they be agreeable to his holy Word and with due regard to him who is in all things infinite. Accordingly whereunto we say; That as for things in the order and manner of the Creature are *simul tempore*, together as to their beginning in time, which are not, *simul naturâ*, together in their own nature, one of them causing the other to be; as the Sun, and the light of it; Fire, and the heat of it: In like sort, Gods election of men, and his purpose to send Jesus Christ; these two, though they be both alike *ab aeterno*, yet *naturâ*, the Election of his Church, goeth before his purpose to send his Son. And this I prove by those words, *So God loved the world, that he gave his Son: 1. John 4.* He loved us, and sent his Son. Therefore whether it be Gods love and mercy to mankind, in the general; in special to the Elect; and whether election be to particular persons, or beleivers in general; Gods love doth go before his purpose or decree to send his Son, because he sent his Son out of his love to Man.

When a Christian Prince, hearing of such a number of his subjects, held captives under the Greke Turk, doth send such a sum of money as is demanded; in this case certainly his good will that he bestoweth to those his subjects, doth precede his sending the money, or his purpose to send the money for their Redemption.

The Love of God, is, *Causa procumena*, quæ



*motus ad agendum*, which some call *causa antecedens*, the cause moving from within, The Death of Christ is, *Causa procatartica, quæ extrinsecus motus ad agendum*, the cause moving from without: and therefore subsequent to the other, though both be considered together; as he that resolves upon the good, doth therewithall deliberate and resolve of the means tending thereto. Gods Love, or good will is an antecedent cause to Christs manifestation. And a foundation is for the good and benefit of what is builded upon it; so was Christ given in *caput Electorum*, to be a Head, and a Mediatour, that by him the Elect might be brought to Glory. Although therefore the son of God, be the Authour and finisher of our Salvation, if we speak of the Execution of it in time; yet if we speak of the Decree of it, before all time; So Christ is not the foundation of our Election, but Gods love is. And yet I hope, he will not say, we lay any other foundation then Christ, according to the Apostles sense, 1 Cor. 3. any more then the Apostle himself did, when he said in one place, *The foundation of God standeth sure*, 2 Tim. 2. and in another, *We are built upon the foundation of the apostles and Prophets*, Eph. 2.

Thirdly, he teacheth that Christ is not onely *Fundamentum electionis*, but *subjectum* also, and *primus electorum*, as if God did choose Christ first, and then others; and two places are brought in the margin, wherein he is said to be *Gods Elect*; Isa. 42. 1. *Behold my servant whom I uphold, my Elect in whom*

my

*my soul delighteth: and 1 Pet. 2. 4. To whom cometh as to a living stone, disallowed of men, but chosen of God, and precious.* These two places are alledged to make good his new Doctrine, that the Great Myſterie of Election, which in his Title he promiſed to be open, is in the prime notion to be underſtood, of Gods chooſing of Chriſt.

I anſwer, It is needfull that be done, that he hath omitted; and that is, to diſtinguiſh, and remove the darkneſs, that ariſeth from ambiguity. There is *fourfold Election.*

1, To an office. So *David* was choſen King whiles he followed the ſheep: and our Saviour choſe the twelve to be Apoſtles.

2. To the Church viſible; So God choſe the people of *Iſrael*, *Deut. 7. 6. The Lord hath choſen you to be a ſpecial people.*

3. To the Church inviſible, or the myſtical body of *Jeſus Chriſt*, *Joh. 15. 19. I have choſen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.*

4. To ſalvation, or life eternal, *Eph. 1. 4. According as he hath choſen us in him, before the foundation of the world. 2 Theſſ. 2. 13. God hath from the beginning choſen you to ſalvation.*

Now both the places abovesaid, where Chriſt is ſaid to be Elected, are meant of an Election to an Office, or Place, Honour and Dignity, as the context, and plain reaſon evidently ſhew: in *Iſai 42* he is, *To give judgement, to make Laws, to be a teacher, to be a light of the Gentiles, to open the blinde eyes, and*

*bring*

bring forth the prisoners. All these belong to his Royal and Prophetical Office. And in that place of Peter, his office is likewise spoken of. *To whom coming*] as to one in chief place, that in him we may be established: *a chief corner stone*] this is for the good of others, to hold the building firm: and such as was the Reprobation, or Rejection; such was the Election surely. But the Rejection was in this to be in no place at all: therefore the Election must be in this, to be in the chief place of all. So we may say that our Saviour was predestinated, and preordained, *ad Officium*; but if we say, that he is the first of the predestinate, or *primus Electorum*, who then is *secundus*? None: for none is there of that order to follow. Jesus Christ is chosen to an Office: Believers are chosen to salvation, Each of these is called Election. But the one is not of the same kinde, that the other is.

Therefore, inasmuch as he hath not brought any place where it is said, that Christ was elected otherwise than to an Office: and inasmuch, *secondly*, as Election to salvation or life eternal importeth either a lost estate, as in men; or a changeable and hazardous estate, as in Angels, who are said to be elected, *1 Tim. 5.* and inasmuch *thirdly*, as the Manhood of our Saviour never had any personal subsistence, but was immediately assumed to the God-head, past all possibility of falling into sin and misery; in these regards, I leave it to be considered, whether or no, and how Christ may be said to be elected to salvation.

But

But if in no place of Scripture this Election be spoken of, then sure I am, this is none of the Election that ought to have been spoken to, in the Answer to the Question above-said.

*Fourthly*, he teacheth that Christ is not onely the first Elected, but the onely elected personally [in] him all the seed springing forth of the travel of his soul. All, in the general, not *one* in particular, not any determinately. But the Apostle saith, *2 Tim. 2. 19. The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal. The Lord knoweth WHO are his. Qui*, not *Quales* who, not how qualified, as, that they are true believers, and obedient. This general consideration may soon be known by every one. But you may say again, Every one cannot tell *who* they be that are truly faithfull and obedient: but the Lord knoweth in particular who they be that are such: to this I return, That unless final perseverance be yeilded this is no sure foundation: this is no seal, the which useth to be for certainty and assurance: that foundation standeth not sure, that is subject to change, revolt, and apostacy. *Qui sint*, therefore cannot be believers in general: if you say, *Qui sint*, be *credentes perseverantes*, believers that hold on in faith and obedience to the end: then I say, this is not to the scope of the Apostle, which is to comfort the people of God against the fearfull example and offence of Apostates. *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* have erred and overthrown the faith of some: if some fall away, and draw others after them, who can be se-

cure

cure? We may all be seduced, first or last: No, saith the Apostle. *Nevertheless* ] that is, though some fall away, and others follow, yet Gods elect shall stedfastly abide; But here were no comfort for beleev-ers, if onely those who persevered in true faith and continued to the end, should then, upon their perse-  
verance and continuance be sure not to fall away, as *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* did.

“ *Qui. 140. May not men be said to be  
“ elected in their beleev-  
“ ing?* ”

“ *A. Yes, in respect of an actual ele-*

“ *ction (or executing the Decree of E-*

“ *lection) which is the actual taking a*

“ *man out of the world, into fellow-*

“ *ship with Christ and God in him.* ”

It is true that when men do beleave, they may be said, and are said sometime, to be *Elected* then; But who takes upon him, either to write a Systeme of Divinity, or a Catechisme pretending to lay open these great mysteries, useth not, and ought not to term this *Election*, but *vocation*; according as the Apostle doth call it, and distinguish it from *Electi-*  
on, in that chain, Rom. 8. 29, 30. And he hath here in his Margin made a kinde of Medley, of all the four sorts of Election above specified, as may appear by view of his Texts.

1 Pet. 1. 2. is spoken of Election to life eternal.  
chap. 2. vers. 9. *a chosen generation* ] of election to

the Church visible. Joh. 15. 16. *I have chosen you, that you should bring forth fruit*] is meant of choice to their office of Apostleship. vers. 19. *I have chosen you out of the world*] is meant of Election to the Church invisible, which is all one with Vocation. That of the fourth psalme, *The Lord hath chosen* (so our English vulgar, but others, *separated*) *to himself the man that is godly*] is to be understood of Election, or separation to an office, namely the Kingdom. Psal. 65. *Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth*] is meant of choosing or admitting to the Church visible, namely of a particular congregation; so it followeth, *and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts, we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy Temple.* Isai. 14. 1. *The Lord will choose Israel and set them in their own land*] is meant of Election to the Church visible constituted: and 2 Pet. 1. 10. of Election to life eternal.

Thus hath he obscured what he undertook to open, whether out of too much artifice, or too little Art; I will suppose the former.

“Qu. 141. *But did not God choose by Elect to holiness and glory, in their own personal considerations?*

Eph. 1. 4.

“A. No sure, neither as in Adam standing, nor as in him fallen, nor as in themselves considered, but as in Christ.

As if they might not be considered personally, and in themselves, and either standing or fallen; and yet withall, be chosen in Christ, *Not in Adam*, saith he, *standing or fallen, but in Christ.*] So then as it is commonly said by some, that the Elect were considered standing, by others, fallen; before, or when Christ did choose them; So now they must be said, to be in Christ when they were chosen [*In Christo*] must not go to *Elegit*, but to *Nos*,] *Elegit nos existentes in Christo*. God chooseth us when we are true beleivers. But this is not his sense, although divers have so taken Eph. 1. 4. He hath helped us elsewhere to know his meaning here. In the Preface to his other work. § For the matter. [We were chosen to blessing and holiness in him, as the present Freeman of Lynn, might be said to have been, by foregoing Kings, chosen to such priviledges as they have now, in the first choosing it to be a Corporation, and in those that were then made members of it.] We see how small and faint a matter he maketh of Election, if any thing at all: A King of *England*, that above a hundred years now past, did choose a Corporation (if you call it choosing) neither did, nor doth, choose them who are admitted freemen since that time, any more than he did choose their chief Magistrate, this year; or their Burgesses that were sent thence to the last Parliament. There is no Election, where there is no knowledge, of what is chosen, what refused. This similitude therefore can neither prove

nor illustrate being false in the ground of it : yet it helpeth us to his meaning, or interpretation of those words, *Elegit nos in Christo* ; which is this, God chose us in choosing Christ : Chose Christ first, in him chose them, who should in after ages beleeve in him. This gloss did well become the Problems of that hardy adventurer, who attempted to wrest and winde up our English Articles to the Church of Rome. But for M<sup>r</sup> *Horn*, who promised to cleave perfectly to the word, he might very well have looked onward to the next verse, vers. 5. where it is, *per Christum*, by him ; which might very well interpret *in ipso*, in him : and he might very well have looked on to the seventh verse, where it is *in quo*, in whom we have forgiveness. What ? had Christ forgiveness first, and then we in him ? had he Redemption through his blood, and then we in him ? No but God did forgive us, and redeem us, and bless us, and choose us through him, or by means of him, or with respect to him, as our Mediatour : or he might have interpreted this place by 1 Thess. 5. 9. God hath appointed us to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ ; which is as much as this, he hath chosen us to salvation in Christ. And as his similitude is not true, so neither is it fitted to the Mystery now spoken of. For God Almighty did chiefly, and in the first place ( so far as we may be able to make difference ) choose his people to salvation, and in the next place chose Jesus Christ, to the office of Mediatour ( no other Election of him I know spoken



ken of) Jesus Christ was the gift of God; for having chosen his Church, he gave his son to be their Head to bring them together, and to hold them together, that they might not fall and be lost, as they were under the first Adam.

But to prove Election to be personal, and not of the generalitie of beleevers; and yet withall to be in Christ, I alledge that place in Revel. 13. 8. where it is described by *Names written in the book of the Lamb slain.* A book, here is a Catalogue of Names, as Gen. 5. and Matth. 1. and *names* are of persons. And the book of life, is the book of the Lamb slain, because God doth not save, or bring to Glory his Elect, but by intervention of Christs satisfaction, that Justice and Mercy may stand together. This place of Scripture, hath our Authour in his Essays, a late piece of his, in a long and laborious discourse, vindicated from this sense, and this purpose. The sum is this. *Names*, saith he, *written in Gods book*, are not those by which we call men, as *John, James, &c.* but their qualities in the general, by which men may be called. The wise in heart shall be called prudent, Prov. 16. So the Elect are called Righteous, Meek, Mercifull, Godly, Fearingers of God; these names, were always in the book of life, but are newly put upon beleevers, when they receive Christ, and be qualified, with new frames and dispositions, and this, he saith, appears clearly & beyond all contradiction, to be the genuine import, of those so often abused Scriptures, touch-

“ing *names written in the book of life.*] I answer, not beyond *all*, for it is in some contradiction to himself; it is his common Doctrine, and in particular beneath at the Qu. and Answ. 202. That we may not gather Gods love or Election, from our duties of obedience, or inherent graces. Are these qualities and dispositions names always written in heaven, and put upon beleving persons when they do receive Christ, and are endued with those qualities; and shall they not signifie that God hath *then* elected, and doth *then* love such persons? Shall they be names in the book of life, and shall they not nominate the persons upon whom they are put, as heirs of life? This therefore is in clear contradiction to himself. He should not be so forward as he is, to accuse his brethren for making a mingle-mangle, of some matters they take in hand; for he hath here most confusedly mingled together Qualities with Names, Names proper with names appellative, and if his Atchievements take place, and be answerable to his essays, he will go near to bring us all to Babel, that none shall understand other. If the Messenger that bringeth to a Corporation, the precept for Election, should deliver it to the chief Magistrate there, with these words; Sir, I have brought you here a writing for choice of Burgesses, together with the names of those whom you are to choose, for to serve in Parliament; hearing this, he would perhaps think, there were sent him a *Conge d' eslire*, and fear some infringement of libertie: but opening

it and finding nothing but some general and usual qualifications, well consisting with freedom of choice; he might very well chide him for such abuse, and ask him where he learned to talk so frivolously and so fondly. Qualities are not Names; neither are Names Qualities: Qualities are inherent in us; Names are imposed on us: neither is that a mans Name always by which he is called. Noah was righteous and he was called so, yet that was not his name. Moses was meek, and was called so; yet that was not his name. In the language of holy Scripture, Names do signifie Persons, and individual Substances: *he calleth the stars by their names: I know thee by name, Exod. 33. I have called thee by Name, Isai. 43. He calleth his own sheep by name, Joh. 10.* Can any take these places to be meant otherwise, than of individual and personal notice? Nothing will serve M<sup>r</sup> Horn, but such names, as *John* and *James*, and so long as we cannot finde these spoken of in Gods word, he will not yeeld, there are any such written in heaven; nor any personal Election: but what if he can finde such names as *Clement*? Will that satisfie him? when the Apostle saith Phil. 4. 3. with *Clement* also, and other my fellow-labourers, whose *Names* are written in the book of life; I take his meaning to be this; as if he had said, with *Clement*, and those others, whom though I name not now in this Epistle, as I do *Clement*; yet are their names written far more happily elsewhere, even in the book of life with God in heaven. Such names there-

fore, as *John, James, Clement*, we say, but understand still what we say, *θεοπροπιως*, are written in the book of the Lamb slain.

“Q. 142. Doth not the Scripture tell us  
 “that God elected *Jacob* personally to sal-  
 “vation, and rejected *Esau*, personally from  
 “it, before they were born, or had done  
 “good or evil?

“A. God did elect *Jacob*, but the  
 “Apostle neither says personally, nor  
 “to or from salvation.

“Qu. 143. How are we to understand  
 “him then?

“A. That he chose *Jacob* nationally  
 “(that is, him and his posteritie to be  
 “priviledged with the choice means  
 “of salvation above all nations, and  
 “therein gave him the Dominion,  
 “and rejected *Esau* and his posteritie  
 “from the same, yet so as his family,  
 “and all the families of the earth, had  
 “blessing in *Jacob's*, and might have  
 “enjoyed it, in submitting to him.

“This appears to be the Apostles  
 “meaning: 1. The Oracle to *Rebecca*  
 “speaks of them as of two nations.  
 “2. The Prophet *Malachi* applies it to  
 “their posterities. 3. The Apostle  
 “speaks of casting off the nation of the  
 “Jews

“ Jews. 4. Nor doth he speak of them,  
“ as so reprobated, that it was impossi-  
“ ble for them to be saved.

*First*, Let it be supposed, that the words are not taken personally, but are to be taken of the Israelites preeminence above the Edomites in outward and temporal Priviledges: yet this is enough by accommodation, to shew that God is free in his choice, and refusal; in that they who are every way alike, are not alike dealt withall, whether it be in worldly blessings, or spiritual, or eternal: if temporal inheritance be of Gods purpose wholly, not of works; then also the heavenly: and why may not one Person, as well as one People, be loved, and another hated, before either good or evil done?

But *secondly*, The Election and the Rejection were Personal. The Scripture in *Genesis*, speaketh primarily of their Persons: in *Malachi*, secondarily, and by application, of their posterity. Answ. to Qu. 143. [ Him and his Posterity ] The persons therefore of the Heads of the respective nations, are not to be excluded. And in particular, for the personal Reprobation of *Esaú*, if that must be spoken to: 1. Holy Scripture saith, he was a *profane person*, for that he sold his Birth-right for a Break-fast: it is not said, he was unwise, to make so foolish a bargain; but profane, so to under-value and part with his inheritance of the land of Canaan, the right he had to the promise, and to the covenant made with *Abraham*,  
in

in so contemptuous a manner. 2. It is said he was *hated of God*. Now though hatred may sometime signifie less love, yet not always, yet not here likely, where there are such Synonymous phrases, as *hardened vessels to dishonour, vessels of wrath*. 3. The Apostle bringeth *Eſau* for an example, or proof, that some of *Abrahams* children may be rejected, may be children of the flesh, and not children of God, not children of the promise, *Rom. 9.8, 13*. Let us not go about to make void the Apostles argument. Nevertheless, if any man will contend, that as the blessing conferred on *Jacob*, and denied to *Eſau*, were typical; so also was the Election of the one, and the Rejection of the other: and that *Eſau* was onely *Typus Reproborum*, and that he did repent afterwards, being reconciled to his Brother, *Gen. 33*, and return to the Church of God. The Allegorical exposition of these two texts, in *Genesis* and *Malachi*, are sufficient to confirm the Apostles Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, which he treateth of in those three chapters, *Rom. 9, 10, 11*.

Secondly, whereas our Authour would have the Election of *Jacob* to consist in this, that he and his posterity were priviledged, with the *choice* means of salvation. 1. It moveth some wonder that so great weight should be laid upon the greater or less means of salvation, by them who hold all men in the world to have sufficient means of salvation.

2. *Jacob* and *Eſau* were brought up alike in the same family, instructed in the same religion, made

alike

alike partakers of the seal of the righteousness of Faith, thus far they were not differenced.

3. A Catechist who pretends to deliver common grounds of Divinity, should deliver them in common terms of Divinity. In his Title, was, the mysterie of *Election*: But to be priviledged with the means of salvation, this is, and ought to be called *Externall vocation*, which is expressly contra-distinguished from Election, by our blessed Saviour, when he saith, *Many are called, few are chosen*. And accordingly S. *Paul* here shews the difference, betwixt the Church visible, and invisible; and that all are not Israel, that are of Israel, because God chooseth and refuseth whom he will, of those who belong to the Church, and partake of the outward Call: but he makes no comparison or opposition betwixt Israelites and Echnicks; nor betwixt Christians, and Infidels; nor betwixt those that have more means, and those that have less means: But to remove the offence, which did arise from the Jews rejection of Christ and his righteousness, he sheweth that God doth keep his promise with *Abraham*, in that he saveth his children of the promise, whom he chooseth to Glory, whether they be many or few, whether they be Jews or Gentiles.

4. It had been agreeable and tending to our Authors designe, if he could have shewed, that in these three chapters, 9, 10, and 11; there is no other love nor hatred spoken of, or intended, but onely as thus far, that God offers to some the more choice means  
of

of Salvation; to others, but ordinary and common means: and that to shew mercy, and to harden, is the same with affording choice means, and ordinary means. But this he could never do. Did God love his Church of the Old Testament, less than us of the New Testament? Was his love so much less to the Kings and Prophets, who desired to see Christs day, then it was to the Apostles, who saw what the others desired to see, but could not see? Or was *Capernaum* more beloved of God, then *Tyre* and *Sidon*, so far as the one should be said to be loved, the other hated? the one elected, the other reprobated? In whatsoever way it be, that God may be said to harden, he hardeneth them that he sends the best means to, as soon as any other: yea, by his word he hardeneth them. To the Prophet he saith, by whom he sends, and when he sends his word, *Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy*; and the Gospel preached by the Apostles themselves, was the favour to death, as well as to life. *Luke 11. 49. The wisdom of God said, I will send them Prophets and Apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute*; He sends oftentimes, and in wisdom sends, where he knoweth little good will be done. Or he should have shewed, that there is no Election or Rejection spoken of, in all that discourse of *S. Paul*, to or from salvation. But this he could never do: for the Apostle speaketh of an Election that is made out of those who have choice external means: a choosing out of these. Among the Israelites who were for number

as the  
Paul  
God  
call  
Elec  
lites  
salua  
prop  
it is  
Faco  
Apo  
conce  
of M

The O  
signific  
make ro  
and suit  
Rom. 9

He  
scoffin  
figura  
ously  
mative



as the sand, a remnant saved, chap. 9. 27. of whom *Paul* was one, chap. 10. 1. there was a people whom God fore-knew, vers. 2. that is, a people not onely called, but chosen. Israel hath not obtained, but the Election hath obtained, vers. 7. Out of the Israelites therefore, who were elected to choice means of saluation, there was an Election to life eternal, which properly is called the myserie of Election. But now it is to no purpose all that he hath said, concerning *Jacob* and *Esau*, unless he intended to prove that the Apostle hath not rightly alledged the Testimonies concerning them, out of *Genesis*, and the Prophecy of *Malachi*.

“ Qu. 145. But says not the Scripture,  
“ that God made Pharaoh to destroy him?

The Original  
signifies, To  
make to stand:  
and suits with  
Rom. 9. 22.

“ A. No: but he made him stand, or  
“ raised him up, ( namely, out of former  
“ judgements ) and forbore him with  
“ much long-suffering, when a vessel of  
“ wrath, fitted to destruction, to glori-  
“ fie his name and power thereby the  
“ more abundantly.

Here the Catechist plays the *Mimus*, and in a scoffing imitation puts not a proper question, but a figurative Interrogation, crudely enough and invidiously; which being negative, must be resolved affirmatively; Says not the Scripture? *q. d.* the Scripture

pture doth certainly say so, at least, as the pretended Orthodox, have made the world beleeve. And yet they never said more in this, then the Scripture saith, namely, that God raised up *Pharaoh* to shew his wrath upon him, for his own glory. The word is diversly rendred and expounded: but whether it be *Feci*, *Creavi*, *Excitavi*, *Posui*, *Feci surgere*, *Feci stare*, (any of these) or whether it be *Feci restare*, h. e. *superstitem manere*, agreeably to the Septuagint: I have reserved thee, preserved thee, or kept thee till now; it is not much material. They who give the sense according to any of the first forenamed, do think it suits with *Prov. 16. 4. The Lord hath made the wicked for the day of evil*; and do think that the Apostles word, *Rom. 9. doth suit with it, ver. 17.* and there is nothing, *ver. 22.* against it: They think the Apostle may explain himself, *ver. 20.* Why hast thou *MADE* me thus? *ver. 21.* --of the same lump to *MAKE* ---. Howsoever those sound Interpreters who follow the Septuagints meaning [I have kept thee from former judgements] do not think it any prejudice to that cause, in opposition of which it is here produced: for if God Almighty did defer and suspend his judgements, and continue him in being, for to shew his glory in taking vengeance; the Apostle might well apply it further; whether he were raised, or reserved; it shews the freedome of Gods Sovereignty, and power to dispose of his Creature to his glory, whether by shewing mercie, or by hardening.

“ Qu. 146.

H  
vess  
unde  
fel o  
a les  
lowe  
doth  
for t  
some  
ciset  
Thu  
foll

“Qu. 146. How then saith the Scripture that God hath power, as a Potter  
“over the clay, to make of the same lump,  
“one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour?”

“A. To shew that God may do with  
“his own what he will, distribute to  
“them what he pleaseth, preferring  
“one before another in means of salvation, forbearance toward them, or  
“power exercised for their good, as in  
“the case of preferring Jacob and his  
“posterity before Esau, & his. Though  
“yet those he honoured, abusing their  
“honour, were broken off, when the  
“dishonoured were made vessels of  
“Mercy through faith in Jesus Christ.

He telleth us when God doth make any man a vessel of honour, and leaveth it plain enough to be understood, when he maketh any man to be a vessel of dishonour; that is, when he vouchsafeth him a less degree of the favours specified. When he alloweth any man less means of salvation, than he doth to another: and when he sheweth less power, for the good of one, than he doth for the good of some other. For God forbeareth all men, and exerciseth power for the good of all men, more or less. Thus much being premised. I come to observe as followeth,

*First,*

*First*, it is a matter that causeth scandal to the common people, to ascribe so much to the difference of the means, conducing to salvation, that the very Degree, of greater means or leis, should be able to make men vessels of honour or dishonour. They need not be assisted, in setting up such superstitious fancies, and conceits of their teachers, and outward helps to holiness and happiness. For 1. some are too forward to think themselves safe, so long as they live under an eminent ministry, though they learn little, and practise leis. And 2. some others are too ready to lay the blame here, and give this the reason, why they and the world about them amend no faster, because they are no better taught. Worldly men, when they have no minde to finde the way to true conversion, and reformation; begin oftentimes to quarrel with their Ministers and Pastours, as not being qualified with *awakening* gifts: their way of preaching is not *efficacious*: and, who was ever known to be converted by a Liturgy? forgetting in the mean time the 16 chapter of S. Luke: where, as there is set before us and laid open the state of the other life or world; so is there also a window opened to mens breasts & thoughts, that we may know what fond conceits they have. *Nay, father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead, they would repent; and he said unto them, if they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*

*Secondly*, A Doctrine it is uncomfortable, and uncha-

uncharitable, to teach, that those persons, for examples sake, who living in the darker corners of this Land, have not so plentiful instructions, as others have, are therefore made of God to be vessels of dishonour. God seeth not as man seeth; chooseth not according to outward appearance and accommodation; but requireth of Christian people, according to what they have, and not according to what they have not: it lies not all upon the edge of the instrument, or weapon; but strength of the hand, in this work: and oftentimes, the first are last, and the last first. Mans life consisteth not, whether it be corporal or spiritual, in the abundance of the means that he possesseth, but in Gods blessing and heavenly influence, which causeth often, as good health and habitude with *Daniels* pulse, as *Benjamins* double Mess.

*Thirdly*, A like Doctrine it is to teach, that whom God forbearth not, but chasteneth and scourgeth early, they are therefore vessels of dishonour, but who knoweth not that Judgement useth to begin at Gods house: and that if there be a difference, he least of all forbearth those that be his own: the fruit of this Doctrine would be, to add affliction to the afflicted, and help to make up the measure of their sufferings, who finde not the power of God exercised for their good, with the mark and designation of reprobates.

In the very next verse following the mention of vessels to honour and dishonour, it is said that, *God*

G

endureth

endureth with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath, Rom. 9. 22. and doth forbearance help to make a vessel of honour? spoken of vers. 21. Our Authour either could not or would not see what was next at hand, and lay plain before his eyes: otherwise, Almighty Gods forbearance to punish, had never entered the description of a vessel made to honour.

*Fourthly*, he interprets that to be a vessel to honour, upon which any honour is conferred, though for the duration, temporary and transitory, for such are all the honours that he mentioneth. Thus Judas, even then, when an Unbeliever, Thief, and Devil, was notwithstanding a vessel of honour, according to the Dialect of these instructions, because he was born withall, and preferred in outward means to life eternal before thousands of others, whereas this preposition, *In*, *IN honorem*, *IN contumeliam*, not of, but to honour, and dishonour, being a final particle, and denoting the end, cannot otherwise well be taken, than to denote a final state and condition permanent. Had it been his aim to take the Apostles sense, and not to force a meaning upon him; in the very next verse, vers. 22. he might have seen explained what is meant by vessels of honour, namely, vessels made up and fitted to destruction, not less forborn, less regarded, and honoured.

*Fifthly*, according to the tenour of the answer above said, the same person may be a vessel to honour, and dishonour both; successively, at sever

times; that, confessedly: but not onely so, but *sensu composito*; at the same time, he shall be a vessel of honour, because he is preferred before some others, and a vessel of dishonour, because some others again are preferred before him, in participation of divine patience and goodness, and outward aid. For thus it must needs be, in the several degrees, and the variety of these kinds of favours vouchsafed of God to the sons of men.

*Sixthly*, if we view the words before, that gave the occasion to these, we shall soon perceive how unlikely a matter it is, that either Jew or Gentile, should charge God above with injustice, or that the Apostle should defend Gods justice, by checking the presumption of humane reason; and yet nothing be objected but this, that God useth some men better than he useth others, in patience towards them, and means tending to life, and power exercised for their good.

*Lastly*, there would be no colourable cause of complaint against God, nor should any man need to say, why hast thou made me thus? if it be in his power to make himself otherwise, to make himself, even as he will, notwithstanding any thing that God hath done. He may haply honour one man more than another, in outward mercies, and dispensations, which thereafter as a man shall well or ill make use of, he shall make himself accordingly a vessel of wrath, or mercy.

God in mercy made the people of Chorazin and

Bethsaida, vessels of honour (if we can be persuaded so to call it) by the mighty and gracious works wrought among them. But they by abusing this honour, made themselves truly and indeed, vessels of dishonour. And others again who were dishonoured of God, by having fewer Talents, through good improvement of them, became vessels of glory and honour. The rule of our belief teacheth us otherwise, Gods purpose of Election doth stand or abide firm, Rom. 9. 11. his Counsel is immutable towards the heirs of promise, Hebr. 6. 17. vessels of honour and dishonour, being no more interchangeable here, than gold and silver, wood and earth, of which the divers vessels are made, 2 Tim. 2. 20.

Thus much concerning Election.

Of the means of salvation, he hath formerly spoken sundry times, in several Questions and Answers. But he did not tell us how far that term should be extended; whether beyond the Church or no. Now he asketh in

“ Q. 149. *What be those means?*

(namely that God affordeth us towards faith in Christ, and the blessings in him.)

“ A. All those things in which God

“ by Christ, as the light of the world

“ and great Prophet speaks forth him

“ self and goodness to men, whether

“ more



"more generally and darkly ; or more  
"specially, and plainly.

( of the former sort are his works,  
ordered by way of enlargement  
or chastisement, concerning which  
he proceedeth thus. )

"*Qu.* 152. *They speak of God and his*  
"*Attributes, but do they speak any thing of*  
"*Christ ?*

"*A.* Distinctly they do not : but by  
"interpretation and more obscurely  
"they do, as the effect speaks some hid-  
"den cause, or the work the workman.

"*Qu.* 153. *Declare this more plainly.*

"*A.* They manifest and speak that  
"Goodness of God, that could not have  
"been toward us, had not Christ inter-  
"posed between God and us : so that as  
"the Death of men speaks *Adams* sin,  
"so they speak Christs Mediation.

The brief of these instructions is this; according  
to the New light that some blazing Comets have  
afforded us: The works of Creation and Provi-  
dence, bring men to the knowledge of Christ our  
Saviour, and the Sun, Moon, and Stars preach the  
Gospel.

As for Christs interposing betwixt God and us, I  
do in the first place acknowledge, that his Mediation  
is not onely sufficient, that is to say, potentially effi-

cacious, but moreover actually efficacious, for all men in the world, whether they come to know any thing of him or no; yea, for the other creatures also: thus far, as to that mixture and measure of mercy which they enjoy, and conservation of them in that estate, wherein we now behold them. God did so far accept of *Noahs* sacrifice, *Gen. 8.* from which he smelled a sweet savour; that he said, *I will not again curse the ground any more: but while the earth remaineth, Seed-time and Harvest, Cold and Heat, Summer and Winter, Day and Night shall not cease.* It is more likely that the weight of so great a promise, and of such extent, to the worlds end, should rest and bear itself, upon the virtual contents of *Noahs* sacrifice, than upon the Dutie, Obedience, or Religious exercise of *Noahs* person at that time. The sacrifice of *Noah* might please God, but that with which he was pacified and appeased, was the virtue of Christs sacrifice, contained Sacramentally in that of *Noah*, as it was also in all the Propitiatory offerings of the Old Testament, in which was offered and performed true satisfaction and propitiation, though not truly, or in truth, but onely in Type and figure.

And as this promise or purpose of God, touching the preservation and upholding of Man, and all flesh, although it were absolute and not conditionate, nor with any contract made, is yet called in Scripture, a Covenant, *Gen. 9.* taking that term at large and improperly: So hath the Rain-bowe been called a Sacrament of it, in like large and improper acception.

Thus

Thus far we hold that Jesus Christ did interpose as a general Mediatour: but this no way conduceth to the purpose of these Questions and Answers: and that for these two reasons: 1. Because thus much is not known to all men by means of the works or creatures of God, but to some onely, and that by means of his word. 2. Because this Mediation availeth onely, and extendeth onely, to temporal and worldly benefits, not to salvation, or life eternal. Whereas in this Catechisme, the works of God are said to speak a further Mediation, and to be means with which Gods spirit and power is conversant [“To bring men to faith in Christ, and so to the blessings in him, even to be vessels of mercy. Quest. and Answ. 146, 147, 148.

In gainsaying which opinion, I crave leave to ask this question: Do the Sun, Moon, and Stars together with other works of Gods Creation, speak any other language now, then they did before the fall of man? it must be answered, No. As the Sun doth shine alike, at this day upon the just and the unjust; so did it upon *Adam*, while he was in Paradise, and when he was thence excluded. All things continue alike from the beginning of the Creation, 2 *Pet.* 3. which though brought in as the saying of the Impostours, yet doth not the Apostle deny the truth of what is said, but onely their false collection and reasoning thence: namely, that because the world hath so long continued, therefore it must always continue, and never have end. Now shall we think,

that Jesus Christ did interpose as Mediatour between God and us, when as yet there was no need? Or, that there was a Remedy published to the world, before the Maladie was known, or was? If any difference there be in the Dialect and voice of the creatures and works of God; then, they do not utter his goodness towards men *more*, than they did before sin came into the world, rather his anger and punishing hand: The vanity and servitude of corruption, to which the creature is unwillingly subject, testifying as well the frown of Gods countenance, as the sin and fall of man. The characters of Divine Providence, though they be not very dim to be discerned, yet are they very difficult to be disciphred, and do present to the quickest view and apprehension, the Bounty of the Supreme Lord, and the curse of his Law, set one over against the other; but not the contents of the Gospel, or the mercy of a Saviour: The Gospel being Tidings must be brought; and being News, must be told, before it can be known; and being tendred by way of Covenant, implyeth a necessity that notice be given to the parties concerned: Faith in Christ comes by hearing: how can they beleeve in him, of whom they have not heard? Our Redemption is taught us in the school of Christ, not in the Theatre of the world. *1 Cor. 1. 21. After that in the wisdom of God* (that is, in the Glasse of the Creatures, where shineth Gods wisdom, and power, and goodness) *the world by wisdom*, (that is, by their own wisdom, and search, and interpretations,

and

and collections) *knew not God* (not God a Saviour) *it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching* (that is, by making known to the world, that the eternal Son of God was crucified for them) *to save them that believe.* No mystery is known by nature. The Gospel is a mysterie or secret, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. a myste-  
rie which none of the Princes of the world knew.

And whereas he saith, *Qu,* 152. "The works of Creation do speak of Christ, but more obscurely] against this, I argue thus. If heathen persons by means of the creatures were brought to know Christ a Saviour, though more obscurely; Then, when Christ a Saviour is evidently taught, they would have entertained him: But when he was evidently taught, they refused him, and counted his Gospel foolishness: Therefore they did not know him before, no, not so much as obscurely.

When *Paul* preached Jesus at *Athens*, where was highest improvement of natural light, he was not onely encountred by the Philosophers, even the Stoicks, the best of the pack; but a worse matter then so, he was had before the Highest Court, and indicted for innovating in Religion. And every where, as well as there, was the Gospel spoken against, *Acts* 28.

He who should have counted all fabulous that was reported of *America*, or the Western world, at the first discovery; certainly that man never had formerly, any such suspicion or surmise, as *Columbus* had: namely, that of the huge space or quantity of the  
Globe

Globe terrestrial, which the Sun in daily motion compasseth, and which was not then taken notice of, there might be as well land as sea, and that land habitable and inhabited: for had he thus imagined of himself, he would not then have laughed at the story of the New-found land, and held it as a foolish fiction.

Had the Mediation of Christ a Saviour been darkly gathered from the fabrick of the world, and works of Providence; then would it not, when fully, faithfully, and credibly published, prove to be matter of offence, and be judged folly, as it was of them who had no other call but outward. And how could they be seen of them by the less light, that was not seen of them by the greater light, arising, and shining on them?

And whereas he saith, that "*Gods works speak of Christ, as the work the workman* ] it comes in here impertinently, and belongs to the former member of the Division; "*They speak of God, but do they speak of Christ?* So asketh the Question, which is as much as to say thus; The works speak of a Creator, but do they speak also of a Saviour? Now they speak God the *Creator*, and not Christ the *Saviour*, as the work the workman. Secondly, it is true that the work shews the workman: but as the workman, and no further: it shews *qualis*, or *qualitas*, *artifex*, but not *quis*: not his name: if it did, we should not see Artists set their names upon their curious pieces, Such a one *Fecit*, *Sculpsit*: or if he

name

name, not his disposition, and moral character: or if that, not his Will and Testament.

If a Nobleman should build a large and fair house, furnishing it with all things needfull, and making it his place of residence, should freely entertain passengers, for the time they stay with him; thus far may they well reason and conclude: Surely this great man had money enough, neither did he spare for any cost in rearing this edifice. One of good judgement he is, and discretion, thus to contrive the rooms, and order his family in so frugal, and so plentiful a manner: A good and courteous man he also is, to treat us so liberally, that we want neither meat, nor drink, nor lodging, nor attendance. Thus far should they argue well, from the effect to the cause; from the work, to the workman. But too simple and shallow should he be among them, that should conclude thus from the premises: Therefore surely, he will pay my debts; therefore he will put me into his Will, and give me such and such Legacies: therefore he will make me one of his heirs. The works which God hath made, and the blessings he bestoweth on us, with an open hand, and daily loadeth us withall, do witness of him, his goodness, his eternal power and Godhead. But they shew not who he is, they declare not his name, nor that he is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that brought Israel out of Egypt: This is his name; and this is his memorial: they shew not his nature; nor the persons of the Trinity; and therefore not the second

cond person, or the Mediatour : not his Will, how he must be worshipped , and served, in the Covenant of works : much less his Gospel or Covenant of Grace, that he made, and that by way of Testament, with his Church and people, designed by him, to be heirs of his kingdome.

*“ Qu. 155. But can we finde that God  
 “ ever accepted of any faith men acted to-  
 “ wards him, by means of any works of  
 “ his, short of the distinct knowledge of  
 “ Christ ?*

*“ A. Yes sure , both Rahab , and  
 “ Cornelius , and divers others , God  
 “ being no respecter of persons , but  
 “ through the Mediation of Christ ac-  
 “ cepting every one in any nation, that  
 “ ( by what means he affords them ) do  
 “ fear him, and work righteousness be-  
 “ fore him,*

They who have hitherto denied , and opposed the Doctrine of that Universal Grace, which the Patrons of it maintain to be presented to all men, and met withall by all men; have desired , and called for, at the Adversaries hands, the Names of some of those persons , that have at any time by this Grace , been brought home to God ; and have further said, that if any there were to be found , they should



should have heard of them, long ere now, on both ears.

M<sup>r</sup> *Horn* in this Question, puts himself upon the service; and accepts the challenge, which had better be waved, and holds up the cause in such a manner, that he lets it quite fall to the ground: for in the Answer, he produceth onely a pair of Profelytes; the which were Jews in Religion, though not by birth, or nation; and therefore had as distinct knowledge of Christ, as the true Church of God then had. Thus by naming these two, he hath caused withall, good proof to be given in, that none can be named.

When he saith, [ *by what means he affords them* ] he speaketh as if it were already gained and granted, that there is variety of means to the attainment of saving faith; and as if Gods non-acceptation of persons, were partly in this, that he regards not how men come by Grace so they have it, whether by work or word; whether by Nature, or Creature, or Scripture. Whereas *Rahab* and *Cornelius* had no means, but the onely means. And let him finde out whom he can perswade, that the one of them did not learn the faith and fear of the true God, from those whom Joshua sent to Jericho; nor the other living in the Metropolis of Palestine, from the national Jews; but rather from the view and contemplation of heaven and earth.

“Qu. 177. What is herein discovered  
“to be sin?”

“A. All erroneous and false conce-  
“ptions of him, (as if he was like an old  
“man, or cruel, or all mercy, or takes  
“no notice of men and their actions,  
“with all will-worship, according to our  
“own devices, or mens traditions.

*Cruel*] This is an arrow shot upward, and must  
fall somewhere: let them look to it, who are most  
therein concerned. He seeth little who seeth not,  
which way this, and the like rude and unfavoury  
girds do look. This is but a taste for his new begin-  
ners, who may afterward, be laid in, with a larger al-  
lowance to feed on, from his own party, or if need  
be, from his own pen, with *Abaddon*, *‘Asphorodon’*, &c.  
and such like poysonfull stuff, as help to swell the  
Preface to his open door. When *Andradins*, another  
universalist, had argued for his opinion, that Faith  
indeed is necessary to righteousness and life; but may  
be obtained by that knowledge, which is in part  
written in mans heart naturally, and in part acquired  
by the consideration of the Creatures; otherwise,  
*Non posse Deum vel ab injustitia vel à crudelitate de-  
fendi: Chemnitius* took the boldness to say, that  
these were *Cerberi latratus*, pag. 108. *de operibus  
Infidelium*, and yet *Chemnitius* was no Calvinist;  
and yet *Andradins* his words, were not direct and po-  
sitive; but through his confidence spoken, out of  
supposition.

supposition, and putting case, that his own opinion should be false, and his Adversaries true. But it seems some men, choose to be deeply engaged, and resolve to take no quarter; being sworn to their beloved cause, even after the manner of the old *Soldurian's* law: they strengthen their partie with the uttermost breach: and as they who landing sink their ships, they intend not to listen to sound of retreat, nor proffer of compromise. Whereas were their opinion true, and certain, touching Gods decrees, and dealings towards the sons of men; Nevertheless, as earthly Princes love not to hear their power, or prerogatives disputed, much less circumscribed; it were neither true nor safe, to say, that God were unjust, if he should do otherwise.

And I do observe here, the Catechists partiality. He hath included in a different character, four several instances of such as have false conceptions touching God Almighty. The first is, some of the Papists, who worship God in the picture of an old man. The second, his Adversaries, whom he selected to deal withall, in this Catechisme, and against whom principally it was composed, as intentionally for his chief aim, so intensively, for his greatest earnestness: these he meaneth who conceive of God as cruel. The third, they who hold God to be all Mercy, as the old *Marcionites*, and many others now, their near allies. The fourth the Epicureans, who denie Providence; these four. Now of these four, he represents the first, so as they themselves do

do willingly own, what he chargeth them withall. Bellarmine saith, that though it be not a matter of Faith, but of Opinion, yet for his part, he holds it lawfull, to picture God, *in forma hominis senis*, and the 7<sup>th</sup> of Daniel is commonly alledged, where it is said that *the Ancient of days did sit, and the hair of his head was like the pure wooll, (that is, white as wooll) as white as snow.* Rev. 3. And yet perhaps, and by the way; the ground of the proof from thence, may be found to fail. For, first, *Candidum*, and *canum*, are not the same: whiteness, most likely, meaning not hoariness, or age, but purity, or sanctity. *Mundities*, not *canities*, as well in hair, as garment. Secondly, *Antiquus*, and *Senex*, are not the same. *Ancient*, doth signifie Gods Eternity, before all times; but an old man, is looked upon as decaying, and going out of the world, *Et quod senescit prope est interitum*, Hebr. 8. The heavenly Spirits whom God hath placed next himself, in condition and state, as well as in station, are pourtrayed with younger faces commonly: Even as that Angel, that rolled away the stone from our Saviours sepulchre, was *in forma viri*, in the form of a young man, or youth; *quia Angeli nunquam canescunt aut consenscunt, sed perpetuo florent, vigent, vegetique*, as the most learned *Vossius*, hath noted in his Harmony of the Gospel: that is, because the Angels do never wax old, or wither; but are still and always, lively, vigorous, fresh and flourishing. But whether the practice can be made good or no, it is not denied, nor disowned.

No more is that which is charged upon the third sort, who make God all goodness, and mercy; they think they need not be ashamed of this, so pleasing it is, and plausible. And our Authour himself gives them no great discouragement, pag. 268. of his work abovenamed, where the question being concerning Gods desire of mans salvation, how great it is, and of his helpfulness thereto, he makes a kinde of wonder at it, that any man should think [*that we can speak too well of God.*] Our selves in the mean time being judges, what is well and what is ill, thought or said, and understanding goodness, not absolute, but related, which is no other but beneficence, or bounty.

The fourth sort are likewise forward to maintain the opinion that is laid to them, and think it honourable to the supreme governour of the world, not to look after matters of small regard, one of their founders boasted *Relligionum animos nodis exolvere porgo*: and his followers freely make profession. These three the Catechist deals fairly withall, and does them no wrong. But when he comes at the second instance, or the *partie*, as he calls them in the preface, he most invidiously lays to them, that which they never said, nor thought: as if they taught God to be cruel, and as if he were by them so conceived and apprehended to be.

Opposite to mercy named by him, on one hand, standeth Justice, or Severity, as well as Cruelty: but those terms were not for his turn. Cruelty is unjust

H. Severity:

Severity: God punisheth none but for sin, and punishment of sin is no injustice; therefore doth the Apostle abominate the thought, of ascribing to God any injustice, even there where mans reason must least of all be satisfied. This is not their opinion, but a false and odious deduction of his own. So much for his partiality in this place.

*Qu. 199. Why say you it's glad tidings to all people, and the revelation of God righteousness to all? is there any needfulness, or usefulness of beleeving that extent of it, as you seem to innu-  
nate?*

*Rom. 3. 9, 10,  
19, 22, 23, 24.  
and 5. 12, 18.  
2 Cor. 3. 12, 13.  
with 4. 2, 3, 4.*

*A. Yes verily, for seeing that mans misery is so clearly and generally held forth in Scriptures, that any man in crediting them may see himself miserable, it is very behoovefull that the remedy be as plainly, and generally held forth, that any man in crediting the Scriptures may see it is provided for him; yea so useful is this, both in respect of a mans self, and his duty, meanour to others, that none but Satan, and such as he blinds, would persuade men otherwise.*

The holy Scriptures do clearly set forth mans misery

fery to be general, or belonging to all men; but the remedy of that misery is not clearly and plainly set forth to be general or universal, and belonging to all men, otherwise than according to the sense before specified, which is sufficient to encourage any person that taketh notice of it, to lay hold upon it.

That chapter by him quoted, *Rom.* 3. doth in divers verses testifie mans loss, and sinfulness, to be universal, and over all; but the remedy by Christs righteousness, in respect of actual efficacy, is restrained, ver. 22. to them that beleeve. Which restriction is very often expressed, and must be understood in those places, where it is not expressed, and where the universal particle *All*, is barely and solely laid down.

This answer of his, to the question abovesaid, being committed to the memory of the younger sort of people, may do them hurt; and it is not like to do them good, as being no way apt to teach them, either the fear of God, or the reverence of man. Not the fear of God, because it carries with it towards him, so much arrogance, as to prescribe and set down what it behooved him to have done, though it doth not appear he hath done it: Not the reverence of man, because it carries with it towards him so much virulence, as to judge all those to be led blind-fold by the Devil, that are not perswaded God hath done, what is here thought behoovefull to be done, though it be plain and certain he hath not done it.

A multitude is held incommunicable ; What presumption is it then to deliver up multitudes of Churches to Satan for their teacher, because they refuse to follow him, who professeth to leave that road, in which Their guides and worthies have gone before them.

As for that he directs us to, 2 Cor. 4. I answer: Those persons, to whom the Gospel being preached by the Apostle, was hidden; whose minds the god of this world had blinded, that they should not see it in the brightness of it, and hereby were lost, and did perish ; Were not so much beloved of God, as others were, to whom the Apostle preached with better success ; although they had the same choice means of salvation that others had : neither was there so much good will towards them, as there was to others, whose eyes and hearts the Lord did open, that they might see, and beleeve, and affect what was taught, and be saved : much less was there so much good will towards a third sort of men, that were never so much as outwardly called. This we think, this we beleeve, and hold. And if any man shall say, That whiles we are of this minde, and because we think thus much, therefore Satan blinding our eyes, hath perswaded us to it. We will with more modesty return him this advice, that he would beware of another kinde of blindness, which Tertullian speaks of, *Apolog. 9. Cæcitatís species videre videre quæ non sunt* : it is a kinde of blindness to see that which is not, or to see more than is to be seen.

after



after the same manner do we think him to be blind, who can discern that Grace is of the same extent in the world, that Sin is: and that the Salve provided for mankinde, is full out as broad as the sore, (otherwise than as before explained upon Q<sup>1</sup>. 93.) and that looks upon the Gospel, with a false pair of spectacles, by means of which it appeareth far larger, than God hath thought fit it should be.

---

In the Questions and Answers 200, 201. he giveth many reasons, reduced to five heads, why it is behoovefull, that the remedy should be as general, and as plain, as the misery: as, [“ Because it gives  
“ us ground to repent, and bleſs God, and have  
“ good thoughts of him: condemnation of unbe-  
“ leevvers will be more just; a man shall not be laid  
“ open to despair; he shall have good ground to  
“ love, and help, and pray for others.

It is sufficient to speak to these reasons in the general.

*First*, I think it no way bebooveth, nor becometh man, to say, what it behooved God to have done: because by this means Man is made judge of Gods doings: it behooveth, or, it must be, *tenetur, decet, debuit*, are words no way suitable to us, who ought rather to apply our selves, to learn what God hath done, than to take upon us to teach, what he should do.

Just thus is the Popes infallibility pleaded for, and a living Judge. *Regula viva infallibilis*. Very usefull, very needfull it were, that there should be some one to end all questions, and without further argument or appeal, to determine controversies. So were it also that every Bishop were infallible, and that every Parish-Priest were so: and if every particular person were infallibly directed, they should have the greater reason to be thankfull, and their condemnation would be the more just, if certainly knowing their duties and matters of faith, they should refuse to beleieve and do accordingly.

I answer *secondly*, Not every thing must be taught, whether it be true or false, because some good may likely come of it, if it be beleieved. Neither on the other hand, must we forbear to teach the truth, because it may be abused to evil.

The Doctrine of Merit, is a great encouragement to good works; yet, as he will not be held a skilfull Architect, that shall dig up the foundation of a Town, that he may have wherewithall to finish or repair the top of it: So let our builder take good heed, how he doth weaken, and how he doth tamper with the ground-work of free Grace, pretending great need and much benefit that may come thereon. If men will not otherwise bless God, and have good thoughts of him, unless they be taught that he loveth one man as much as another; we must not any whit the more be found false witnesses of God, 1 Cor. 15. 15. false witnesses, I mean, as the Apostle

He meaneth, not against him, but for him, alledging more in his behalf, than will hold true, because we think it makes for him, and his glory. *Will ye accept his person?* saith *Job*, chap. 13. that is, do you think that he will take it well, or be beholden to you, if you go about to shew him more favour, than his cause will well bear, in the truth of it? Plainly, this will fall out to be an accusation, not defence.

*Thirdly*, his Adversaries, who hold universal Redemption, though not every way as he doth; do repent, and bless God, and think well of him, and hope in him, not running into despair, and do love others, and pray for them, and help them: all this they do, and are called upon to do, by vertue of that Doctrine, which they have learned touching Gods love, and Christs Death.

And *lastly*, it would be weighed, whether the people being taught to reason after this manner, be not endangered so far to forget the charge of *Moses*, *Deut.* 29. abovementioned, as quite contrary to it, to be careless in doing duties commanded, and conforming to Gods revealed will; because they are made no further acquainted with his secret intention and purpose; and whether they be not hereby instructed, to stand and capitulate, and be upon points of certainty, with God the Judge, in whose debt and danger nevertheless so much they are: And for his reasons, this may suffice.

Next after these reasons, shewing the necessitie of beleieving the extent of Christs righteousness to all, he proceedeth thus,

“Qu. 202. *May not a man as well and surely know the remedy to be for him, by his beleieving, wel-walking, or the like?*

Prov. 28. 26.

Jer. 17. 9.

Jer. 23. 25, 29.

2 Pet. 1. 19.

“A. No surely : For, 1. The acts of a mans own deceitfull heart, are nothing so evident and sure a foundation of beleieving a thing (no nor any other pretended Revelation) as the word of God is.

*By his beleieving* ] in the Question, Beleieving is opposed to, and set against the word. [ *“not so well by beleieving, as by the word of God* ] whereas we cannot know any thing by the word, otherwise than by beleieving the word. By *beleieving* therefore, as I suppose, he meaneth, the inherent grace or gift of Faith: and by *beleieving* and *wel-walking*, I take him to understand Faith and Obedience: and when he saith in the Question [ *or the like* ] I think he meaneth good affections, and desires, and dispositions. The greatest ambiguity and confusion lieth in those words [ *the remedy to be FOR HIM* ] for they may bear a double sense. 1. He knoweth the remedy to be *for him*, that is, undoubtedly informed, that God hath done graciously *for all*, and *so for him* ] as our Authour speaketh in his Answer to Quest. 200. or  
that

that knoweth that Christ died for all the world, that whosoever beleeveth in him should not perish. Thus the remedie is *for him*, provided that he seeketh to enjoy it, and attain it. 2. He knoweth the remedie to be *for him*, to whom it is so applyed, that he is assured it hath taken place on him, that he hath found relief, and is cured, and hath obtained Peace and Pardon and Justification. He that knoweth the remedie to be for him in the first sense, may possibly not know it to be for him in the second. So plainly they be two severall matters, and yet here they are made all one. The Orthodox do say, That a Christian by faith, obédience, and the testimonie of the Spirit, may assuredly know, that the remedie of Christs Death, and the benefits of his Passion are his own, and efficaciously applyed for the raising him to spiritual life, and hope of inheritance incorruptible. But can any man know the remedie to be for him *thus*, by the word of God alone, setting aside the consideration of faith and obedience? he cannot. Well may he question the truth of his faith, that hath no better ground to beleieve that Christ hath done away his sins, than this; That he hath done away the sins of all the persons in the world.

How he demeaned himself in delivering the Doctrine of the Moral law, we saw before: here we have another smack of his Antinomian leaven, whiles he denieth works, or graces, or faith either, unless it be of his own mark and allowance, to confer

fer any thing to the consolation of a Christian.

He telleth his opinion with some passion, in the  
 "Preface to his other work, §. *Onely where as*  
 "[ Their daubings that tell souls, they may know  
 "that Christ loves them, by their good desires and  
 "endeavours, strifes and labours, my soul abhorreth."  
 We have little reason to think, that he remem-  
 breth the profession that he made at the beginning.  
 To follow the rule of Gods word, howsoever he  
 might leave the common-road, for most certainly  
 he hath here left both the one and the other. Holy  
 Scripture teacheth us to argue from our Sanctifica-  
 tion to our Justification, as being two things never  
 severed in the person, or their subject; though they  
 be distinguished in their nature. *If any man be in*  
*Christ, he is a new creature*: and he that is renewed,  
 may be assured, that he is in Christ, and that Christ  
 loves him. They are the Characters which he gave.  
 Blessed are the mercifull, the meek, the pure in  
 heart, and they who have good desires, hungering  
 and thirsting after righteousness: and he hath told  
 us, that they who do the will of God, shall enter in-  
 to the kingdome of heaven; and that they are in the  
 mean time to him, as his brother and sister and mo-  
 ther. I trust his sheep will never hearken to the  
 voice of any stranger, to the contrary, nor much re-  
 gard great words. They hear the Apostle Paul say  
 2 Cor. 1. 12. *Our rejoycing is this, the testimony of our*  
*conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have*  
*had our conversation in the world.* And they hear the  
 Apo:

Apostle *Peter* say 2 Epist. 1. chap. if vertue, and temperance, and patience and godliness be in you, you make your calling and election sure, and you shall never fall: and they hear the Apostle *John* say 1. Epist. 3. chap. in this the children of God are manifest, even in doing righteousness, vers. 10. and vers. 14. *We know we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren.* There is great cause that that kinde of faith should be suspected, how much soever it be cried up, that must assure our interest in Christ, without good actions, or good affections.

And whereas also he excludeth Revelation, we oppose likewise the Apostles testimony, Rom. 8. 16. *the Spirit beareth witness that we are the children of God.* and 1 Cor. 2. 12. *We have received the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things that are freely given to us of God.* I know no other Revelation the pretended orthodox do pretend to, and he sets himself against none else, and his words are general [*not any other pretended revelation.*]

I think that under those words in the Qu. [*or the like*] may be meant also, changes and alterations, in mens hearts and lives from bad to good: In a funeral sermon of his, pag. 18, 19. he plyeth this matter, much disheartening those that think they beleeve, and are of Gods Elect, because they finde themselves changed and reformed: he telleth them, they ground their faith of Christs Mediation upon their works. *Ans<sup>w</sup>.* Those who are taught

taught, that good works are the product and fruit of faith, cannot ground their faith upon their works. Neither can good Christians value such talk as this while they remember what *S. James* saith, *Shew me thy faith by thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works*. He that is suspected to be dead, may be a stander by, be certainly known to be alive, if he perceive him to draw his breath; and if another of the by-standers shall argue, that it is a great weakness to ground any mans life upon his breath, and that it can be no true life that is so grounded; he would by others, be thought in this, not to be reasonable, but ridiculous.

Mans Conversion is a work of that nature, that it is not always easie to be discerned; neither ought men to be too scrupulous, or curious, in finding the time, means, and manner of it. But where these are obscure, or uncertain, and when doubts and difficulties arise, touching these; the help hath always been from consideration of the change that is wrought in us. If a man may assuredly know that he hath attained his journeys end, and arrived at the desired haven; he ought not too much to trouble himself, about the way, how he came there. Let not therefore Christians be beguiled of this supposition, and relief, but pass by, if need be, the circumstances of time, and place, and way, and insist upon the substance, which is the alteration that is made in which they may do, as well, and upon as certain ground, as to this work upon the soul, as the bla



man did concerning the work that our Saviour wrought upon his body, saying, Joh. 9. *One thing I know, that whereas I was blinde, now I see.* So may true convert say, I was sometimes darkness, but now am I light in the Lord, Eph. 5.8. And the prodigal son, had as much cause of comfort and joy, as the father had, upon the new return, and change appearing, that He who was dead is alive, and he that was lost, is found.

And whereas he told his Auditory then, pag. 19. that it is Pharisaical to conceit, that God loveth us, because of reformatiōs, and frames begotten in us by his grace and [ a certain secret insensible working of power in the heart ] it may be answered, if the work of the Spirit be secret and insensible, what better way can there be, to take notice of it, than by the change and alteration that is made in us? He that would know whether the Sun moveth or not, must not look upon the Sun, nor can he see the shadow move upon the Dial; but if he comes an hour or two hence, he may easily discern, that the Sun and the shadow are removed, and that therefore they did move before. But the truth is, our Authour holds no such internal work, or power needfull to conversion, for of the six helps to Quakerisme, afforded by such as are counted orthodox, this is by him counted the second [ Their speaking of faith as wrought by some immediate power, as besides the word preached. ] but so much for this.

I think

I think, by [the like] in the Question last rehearsed, he may mean also, Consolations, and sense of heavenly joy: for in a discourse of his, called *A Caveat to true Christians*, pag. 84, 85. he much mil-likes, that men should gather comfort or assurance, "from sensible feeling and visits, and saith that such "are thence called sensual, as not living by Faith, "but upon matters of sense: thus he there. But where are they called sensual? who ever called them so? A little before, pag. 82. upon those words of the Apostle Peter, *They that are unlearned, wrest the Scriptures*; he noteth thus. [He means not unlearned in Arts and languages] But I suppose, there be few among us, though so far illiterate, as they be not able to read his book, but even by custome of our English language, have learned the difference betwixt *Sensual*, and *Sensible*. The word [ *sensual* ] is twice found. *Jam. 3.* and *Jude* vers. 19. in both places it stands opposed to spiritual, and signifies as much as *Carnal*: such as intend onely, and are led by, their part sensitive, or carnal appetite, or nature, common to us, with the bruits: (*sensual, having not the Spirit*) and in our common speech, a sensual man, is one that is given to brutish pleasures. Now shall such a Christian, as is visited with the consolations of God, and is made sensible of heavenly light and joy, that can in some sort take up the Prophets words, *in the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart, thy comforts have refreshed my soul*; be called Sensual? It

is true that the sense of divine comfort, and the sight of Gods countenance, may denominate persons sensible, namely, thereof: yet not absolutely sensible, for such we call them that are apt to perceive and understand readily what is done or said. But to say they are, absolutely *Sensual*, is so gross a mistake, that I cannot but wonder it should fall from him who is skilfull in Arts and languages, howsoever undervaluing them in others. Not living by Faith,saith he, but upon matters of sense.] Faith, and Sense, may be opposed, and are sometimes, very distant and contrary; but not as sense is taken here. For they who have, as holy Scripture speaketh, joy in beleeving; or that, as the Apostle *Peter* saith,beleeving,rejoyce with joy unspeakable and glorious; do live by faith, and upon sense too, that is upon sensible consolations, or perception of divine favour: as a man may comfort and chear himself, in a winters night, by the heat of the fire, and the light of it too.

But what is the reason, why we may not beleeve that Christ hath dealt graciously with us, in that he hath bestowed upon us, the gifts of Faith and Obedience; or that we may not conclude spiritual life, from spiritual affections and desires? It is this, *because mans heart is deceitfull*. The Scripture saith indeed, *Mans heart is deceitfull*; but it saith not, that every mans heart, is at all times and in every thing actually deceived. Some men have a custome *lacerare scripturas*; to rend the Scripture, as it were, to tear a text

a text out of the Bible, which they think is for their turn, though against reason, against the Analogy of Faith, and quite contrary to other places which should, by collation, help to interpret. One Scripture saith, Mans heart is deceitfull above all things. Another saith, that our heart doth give a right and true verdict concerning our estates: If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things. If our heart condemn us not, it is so good a signe that we may have confidence towards God. A faithfull Christian may rightly judge of his own condition, though an hypocrite be mistaken in judging of *his*; whose heart yet, as it is heavy in the midst of his mirth and laughter, may likely enough condemn him, in the midst of his confidence and self-deceit. I answer secondly, and affirm, that this rule, here given, or this saying of Scripture, without right interpretation, or due restriction, That Mans heart is deceitfull, and no sure foundation of beleeving a thing, being applyed to other matters in like sort (and why not to others as well as to this?) is a sure foundation or principle of Scepticisme, or beleeving nothing at all which is not many removes distant from Atheisme. With the heart man beleeves: and if the heart be deceitfull in every thing, how can he beleeve any thing? And thirdly he doth not well, to make opposition betwixt a beleeving mans heart, and Gods word. He who collecteth that God loveth him, because he hath bestowed his sanctifying grace

graces upon him ; doth not make his own heart, but Gods word, to be the foundation of his belief. Nor doth he, as the Text pointeth, Prov. 28. Trust in his own heart, but maketh use of his own heart, or reason, in applying the word of God to his own case, and his own benefit, according to the will of God. Now followeth the second reason.

---

“ 2. Nor is such a Faith under the  
Tit. 3. 5. “ Gospel-Declaration, a distinguishing  
Rom. 4. 24, 25. “ Character of Gods Election, as springs  
and 3. 25. “ not up from the love of God, and  
 “ bloud of Christ shed for us, as in the  
 “ word of God declared to us, and by  
 “ the authority thereof apprehended  
 “ by us; as this faith that goes before,  
 “ and is our ground of such an apprehension.

This is his second reason, preferring the faith of the Universalist, before the faith of the pretended Orthodox: The one is no character of Gods Election, the other is. The meaning is this, as if he had said; He who beleeveeth that God loveth all alike, and Christ died alike for all men, as to the intention of benefit by his Death; hath a right faith, even before any grace of Sanctification wrought. But he who beleeveeth that the benefit of Christs Death,

I

who

who died for all, is more intended to some than others, hath no true faith, nor signe of Gods Election, though his faith be accompanied with obedience, good desires and changes, and a pretended testimony of the Spirit. An Assertion, I know not whether he more boldly, or more blindly uttered. I shall touch now onely upon these two particulars, 1. How uncharitable he is to his adversaries, or the dissenting partie. 2. How uncomfortable, to his own partie. 1. He hath no charity for that party, that is not of his own way. I take charity now for that effect or fruit of charity, which is shewed in believing all things, and hoping all things: that is, the best things that may be beleevd, and that may be hoped, touching others. He affirmeth the faith of the Universalist, to be the onely distinguishing character of Gods Election; the faith of all others, be they never so vertuous, pious, sanctified, mortified, to be a false and feigned faith: it seems they set their foot in the wrong way, at first: they began amiss; and now how far soever they go, and how fast soever they go, they still wander and go astray in a by-path. What good can be expected from an ill beginning? what firm building, from a sandy foundation? if the root be rottenness, the fruit can be nothing but dust and smoke. But I answer: That every one may be saved in his own Religion, is an Opinion Anathematized in our Church-Articles. Nevertheless Christians are not wont, I am sure, they ought not to be peremptory, in condemning

one another, upon matters of no greater importance. But of all men, an Universalist, how ill doth it become to be a Monopolist! How ill accordeth that charity to it self (if at least that be not a false charity, that overthroweth the true faith) which is in so high a flow to Heathens, and in so low an ebb to fellow-Christians! But it must not be any great matter with us to be judged by man. That person, who with a true belief can say; The Son of God loved me and gave himself for me: and with an humble and thankfull minde can say, God hath put his fear in my heart; if not researching but adoring Gods secret judgements; he shall forbear to think, that there was as much good intended to every one as to him; hath far more reason to suspect this Catechist for a seducer, than himself for an hypocrite, or unsound beleever. For, supposing it were true, as we are verily perswaded it is not, that God had such a love, and such a gracious intention towards all persons in the world, as this Authour teacheth; yet is not the belief of it, so necessary an ingredient to justifying faith, that it should be no true justifying faith without it. For as the faith of *Peter*, and many others of the Jews, was a true and saving faith, even then when they were ignorant of the extent of Gods Love and Grace in the Gospel, towards the Gentiles, Act. 10. and 11. So we doubt not but the faith of a Christian beleever, may be, and is, a sound faith, and character of Gods Election; although he be to seek in this New disco-

very of Gods good will, and grace extended towards all men in an equal dispensation.

2. As he is uncharitable to all others, so is he uncomfortable to such who do think it best, to leave the beaten path of Gods Church, and follow him. For he doth deprive and spoil them of that assurance and testimony of Gods love, which they had from sanctifying gifts, and inherent graces: having been heretofore rightly taught, that though they might not put confidence in their works, and good desires; yet they might raise and gather confidence and comfort from their works, and good desires, testifying, that their faith is true. And that Apostle who said, That his rejoycing was the testimony of a good conscience, and good conversation; adviseth every man to rejoyce in himself, Gal. 6. 4. And whosoever goeth any other way to work, to get a comfortable assurance, than by these marks of holiness, and fruits of faith; will never be able to distinguish, betwixt a false peace of conscience, and a true; but will be unavoidably exposed to the delusions of Satan.

But it may be thought, that he takes his followers from their former stay, and prop, to help them to a better. What is that? It is to be of his judgement, of Universal Redemption, and Universal Grace. Well: suppose that a sinner were fully perswaded, that God did wish him as well, from the foundation of the world, and as really intend the benefit of Christs Death for him, as for any other Saint, now glorified



glorified in heaven ; There cannot hence arise any strong consolation , whiles withall he is perswaded that God intended as much good from the beginning to *Cain* and *Judas*; and whiles withall he taketh notice of our Authours Quest. and Answ. 95. *Shall all men then be saved eternally ? No, the greatest part go to destruction.* ] So small relief can be had for a distressed conscience, from the common love, or the generality of Gods good will towards all men.

His texts in the Margin, Tit. 3. 5. *Not by works of righteousness, but according to his mercy he saved us:* and Rom. 3. and 4. treating of Justification, cannot be applyed against the knowledge of Gods love that may be obtained by means of Sanctification.

His last reason, why we may not gather out of inherent graces , that there is mercy and remedy for us, is in these words :

LUC. 18. 9, 10,  
11.

3. " This is the way to make men  
" Pharisees, trusters in themselves that  
" they are righteous, and despising o-  
" thers not qualified like themselves.

Not every one that shall do what the Pharisees did, and did amiss, shall presently be a Pharisee, unless he doth it with the Pharisees minde. He that washeth his hands before meat , or when he cometh from market, and concourse of people; must not be

called Pharisee, unless it be done with an opinion of cleansing himself from his sins; or from pollution contracted in company. Not the bare words of the Pharisee, *Luke 18.* but the scope of our Saviour is to be attended; which is, to teach us when we pray to God, to come in humility, and to beware of justifying our selves in his sight and presence, upon confidence of our own righteousness: and to teach us also, that when we approach to God the Judge, it lies not all upon this, Whether we be more or less sinfull, but whether we be penitent or no. For one man may be guilty of many and great sins, and yet truly repenting of them, and craving pardon, and fleeing to Gods mercy, shall be justified and saved. Another man whose sins are comparatively small, if he stands upon his own righteousness, and good deeds, shall be lost. The Pharisees words were unseasonably spoken, and to an ill intent, which nevertheless may be well spoken [ *God I thank thee, I am not as other men are* ]. It is rightly observed, *Finit dat esse in moralibus*: it is our intention that doth formalize our words, or our actions; towards God, or man. As the very same terms may serve (materially) for a Reproach, & a Reproof, according to the different manner and end of the speaker. Thou fool is a reproach, yet *Abigail* called her husband so; and *Paul* called the *Galatians* so, out of their love and good will. So a Saint may say, just as the Pharisee said, and yet deserve no blame for pride nor contempt of others. *Nehemiah* did call to minde what

good he had done for his people, when he presented his prayer to God: and *Hezekiah* said, *Remember, O Lord, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee in truth*: yet who will say that these were like the Pharisee. And the Prophet *David*, *Psal.* 119. doth often make complaint, how others did break the Law of God; and as often doth he make profession, how he kept the Law of God, and was zealous for it; and yet who will say, he was a despiser of others?

I observe of our Authour, that though he think good to conform in his opinions to the Remonstrants, and militate under their Banner, for the most part either following them in their way, or else therein going beyond them; yet he often marcheth over into the Tents of the *Antinomians*, and closeth with them as their own: which two parties, nevertheless, and their Principles, are wholly inconsistent, and opposite in extremes. I instance now, in his opinion touching Good works done after grace received, in this place, and elsewhere touching works morally vertuous, done before Grace received: which by the one partie are magnified near to the *Merit of Congruitie*, as if God did bestow Faith according to the good use of natural gifts, in whomsoever: And by the other part are so vilified, as if they were no way to be thought upon, otherwise than as hinderances, and not steps, in the Church of God, towards true Conversion.

*Essayes* p. 18. he maintaineth, *an equal dispensation of Grace to all men*, and answering that *Sophisme*,

or *captious question*, why of two men, every way alike disposed, going to the same sermon, one should be converted, the other not; he rendreth this reason among many others: Because one may be more vicious outwardly, and having less conceit of his goodness, may sooner receive instruction, than another that is *civilly and religiously inclined*, as the Publicans and harlots entred into the kingdome sooner than the proud conceited Pharisees. ] But first, These two sorts of men, are not every way alike disposed: and secondly, If he had said, That the civilly and religiously inclined, are more ready to receive instruction, than the vicious, he had said somewhat probable: But the quite contrary by him there delivered, is an error; and whether it be a vulgar one or no, it is a very weak one, and very scandalous to weak people. Not that I think there is any efficiency in natural or moral perfections toward the producing of the least degree of saving Grace; But because God Almighty doth for the most part, and in the ordinary way of bringing men home to him, make use of Civil vertues, and outward conformity to Christian duties, as previous and preparative to conversion and regeneration. Neither can I see any manner of solidity in his proof, because it can never be made good, That the Scribes and Pharisees were *not* vicious, or that they were religiously inclined, notwithstanding their ostentation and hypocrisie.

*Trusters in themselves* ] This appellation recoileth

eth forcibly, and therefore better had been spared. He did not well remember here those of his own belief, who had never taken such pains, and troubled the Churches of God in promoting their five articles with such eagerness, in hewing and repairing those broken cisterns with such diligence; but that they had a minde to trust themselves, rather than another. They who will have no decrees touching mens estates, but revocable; They who plead so much, and in such a manner, for freewill, and against free grace; They who like better of their general and sufficient grace, than of any special & efficacious grace; do give us leave to guess, whether they be trusters in themselves or no.

If he be pleased to enquire, it may be, he may finde, that they were of his own party, who thought that saying of our Saviour, that Salvation was not onely difficult, but impossible with men, howbeit possible with God; to be too harsh and rigid; and therefore sought to make it more soft and pliable, by talking up an odd conceit, that turned the *Camel* into a *Cable-rope*, which might by their own hands be untwisted, and pass the needles eye. Little reason was for this, but that they had a minde to keep the staff in their own hands, and trust themselves rather than any other. Yet I say not, that they are as the Pharisees were, trusters in themselves, that they are righteous: but trusters in themselves, that they *can* be so when they will. Thus wicked men are taught by them, to beleve that God would never be so

unreasonable, as to command any thing that is impossible; or bid them work if their hands were bound; or invite them to come to him, if their feet were not at liberty; and so long as God calls them they have power to come. Such who are loth for the present to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts are encouraged to defer their repentance, thinking that they can leave their sins, and be converted, and become new men at their own leisure, before their death, at furthest when they come to leave this life that so they may be elected (for that is the one time of peremptory election) to life eternal. These adversaries Doctrine should not be pressed with the inconvenience of breeding men in security, & sloth and presumption. No Doctrine but may be abused and their own is obnoxious, and liable to the abuse of security and confidence, and self-confidence, at least as much as the other.

“ Qu. 205. *How doth God move Faith, preserve, and increase it by the Gospel?*

“ A. By the cooperation of the heavenly Ghost enlightening mens minds into, and perswading their hearts to embrace the truth and goodness of God, presented to them therein, their hearing, reading, meditating, and conferring about it.

In this Question and Answer, he instructeth his followers in the Doctrine of the Remonstrants, touching The work of God in mans Conversion. *Possent disputari* ( said they at first, so soon as they were known by that name, *Col. Hag. p. 311.* ) *sine hic nobilissimus agendi modus qui fit suadendo*: it may be disputed, whether or no it be not the most noble way of dealing with man, by *perswading* of him: and whether it be convenient to use any other way, with safetie to the properties of humane nature: and whether it be not enough, if as much be done for mans conversion, as Satan useth to do, in drawing men to sin, though there may be some other actions beyond the power of Satan, as immediate illumination of the understanding, which in this business doth much help. So wrote they then. Without further doubt, resolved now, and thought fit to be put among Principles, these two, for Conversion of a sinner; *Illumination*, and *Perswasion*: as if it were no more then to bring a light into a dungeon, and to tell the prisoner, it is better to be abroad at his liberty, then to lie there. Some of those who love not to hear of *Pelagius*, are loth to go much beyond him.

As for Moral perswasion, he hath laid us in a text before-hand, by a new translation, *Epist. to Open Door.* for those words, *Eph. 5. 6.* [ *The children of disobedience,* ] he hath altered to [ *the children of unperswasibleness.* ] As if the worst that is in them, were this; that they will not be perswaded: and  
would

would they but be perswaded, the work were done. But I take his word, and argue thence; If wicked men be unperswafible, as I think they are; then perswasion will not do it; that will not do it alone. There must be that, and somewhat more done. There is no charming of deaf ears: the contumacious will not listen to fair words. No such hooks will draw Leviathan to the shore; no such darts enter his scales, while he sporteth in the deep.

But if not by perswasion, how then? what? by compulsion? Neither. Never yet was any man compelled to either good, or evil. We must, and will think that to be the best and noblest way that God Almighty is pleased to use: and that is, to give a new spirit, and frame of heart; to incline and bend the will to good: yet not to break it, or deprive it of the native liberty, but to cure the depraved nature of it; to amend and rectifie the chief spring or wheel of motion. And this is not to offer violence, or force, any more than was offered to that band of men that followed *Saul*, whose hearts God had touched; or to *Saul* himself, that was turned to another man, 1 *Sam.* 10.

To draw a man to that which is against his nature, this indeed is rather violent, then kindly working. When a Physician hath cured the dropfie once, it is then an easie matter to perswade the patient to forbear immoderate drinking; but before that be done, it is either labour lost, or force offered. The strength of Gods grace overcometh the reluctancie



and rebellion of mans heart, yet not in a hostile way: for as it overcometh the heart strongly; so it inclineth it mildly, and changeth it gently, and healeth it, and raiseth it to a right temper, and better state; so here is more than perswasion. and yet no prejudice to the liberty of will.

And as for *Illumination*, he hath likewise provided a text; *Open Door*, p. 141. whereupon those words, *1 Joh. 1. 7.* [ *If we walk in the light* ] he giveth his paraphrase: "*Whosoever receiveth the light that comes from God, and walks therein, as God is in it, affording power, and strength to him there-through* ] as if all men within the Church were within the light there spoken of, and they walked in it that receive it, being presented to them, and met withall, as our Authour loves to speak.

But by *Light*, the Apostle meaneth *Goodness*, and *Truth*, and *Purity*, as by *Darkness*, *Ignorance*, and *Sin*: verse next before, if we walk in darkness: and chap. 2. vers. 9. *he that hateth his brother is in darkness*; speaking of Christians, not Infidels. To walk in the light therefore, is not to entertain the means, that God affordeth to his Church, universally, as the light of the Sun is spread in the air: but it is to live in Gods faith and fear, in holiness, truth and justice. I grant that God is a *Sun*, as the Psalmist calleth him, and as S. James meaneth, when he termeth him the *Father of Lights*: yea, a spiritual Sun: yet doth he not shed forth his spiritual beams any

any otherwise than by a voluntary dispensation, when, and how, and to whom he will; not presented to all alike, not by every one to be met withall, or to be walked in: so that hence cannot be made good that Universal Objective Grace, by some maintained.

Now that saving Faith is not produced, in the heart of a sinner, by Illumination and Perswasion onely; may be proved by these two arguments. *First*, because they are far unable to do it; for corruption is so deeply fastened in mans nature, and such is his Death in sin, that though his understanding be enlightened, and his affections perswaded, yet if his heart and will be not renewed, and changed and quickened, the work will still be undone.

To perswade, is but to present objects outwardly, and these are looked upon, according as the Subject is disposed; these are apprehended, *ad modum recipientis*, as the party stands affected. Never was there foul love, nor fair prison. Sin, and sinfull lusts are more beautifull in the eyes of a wicked worldling, and are more suitable to him, than the Grace and Glory of heaven, though set forth by a potent Oratour. And the wilde Ais, that hath long been wonted to the range of the hills, scorneth the populous and pompous city.

Illumination likewise, is but an outward work, though it be wrought within man, yet it is external to the heart of man; it is from without, and as I may say  
forinf

forinsecal, and therefore cannot much confer to the power of the soul. It is not Light, but Eye-salve, that must help the facultie, and recover the sight. And this is to be noted further, that where the holy Ghost doth enlighten the minde, and not without all correct the innate pravities of the heart; may follow, and sometime doth follow, the sin against the holy Ghost: which sin, is so called, as we know, not because it is against the person, but against the office, or work of the holy Ghost, which is, to convince, and to illuminate. And the Devils are thought to be guilty of this kinde of sin, because of the height of light in them joyned with the height of malice.

*Secondly*, suppose that these two, could produce true faith, yet this were not enough to make good, what we are often taught, namely, that Faith is not of our selves, but it is the gift of God; yea such a gift as is wrought by the exceeding greatness of his power, even that power that raised Christ from the dead: for what is done should be chiefly by the efficacy of the object, thorowly laid open. And as Satan on the one hand enticeth to the pleasures of sin, so should the Spirit of God on the other, profess holiness, and heaven; and promise, and excite, and invite, and commend: but the will when it cometh to, must cast the scale, and like an impartial judge, no way bent, or made beforehand, give sentence and determine, what is to be done, and what must be followed: and thus shall faith be produced

duced, by man himself, and not be as it is called, *Gods gift*.

And whereas he saith, that God doth work Faith [ by the cooperation of the holy Ghost ] it is to be noted that the Spirit of God in working Faith ( if it be meant of the first production of it ) is not said in sound Divinity to cooperate with man, as if man did co-work with God. For what is done, is the sole work of Gods grace and power. As *Lazarus* being dead, could do nothing, could not cooperate to raise himself to life : but being by divine power quickened, he could then eat, and walk and speak. So man being dead in sin, hath no free will to Good, to Faith or Conversion : but having received Grace, as a principle of spiritual life, he can then walk in the Spirit, and Serve God in a spiritual manner.

“ *Qu. 208. Can any man hear of himself?* ”

*Prov. 20. 12.*

*Rom. 10. 17.*

“ *A. No, as the ability to hear the Gospel outwardly is of Gods gift : so the word outwardly heard, brings to men by the gift of God, power of more inward hearing and attention.* ”

This Question and Answer, what man can do, and what power he hath or hath not, in order to life eternal, doth of right appertain in Divinity to the place

place or Head of Free-will. Yet whereas he saith here: No man can hear outwardly of himself, but it is Gods gift: it may admit a twofold sense: The first is this: No man can come to hear the Gospel outwardly, unless God of his Grace be pleased to send it to him. And this should be his meaning by one of his texts which he quoteth, Rom. 10. *Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.* Which words signifie thus much, if at least the Apostle may explain himself. *Men cannot beleieve in him, of whom they never heard:* neither can they hear but by the word of God: that is, by mandate, or commission from God, to some or other, for to go and preach to them. But this is not his meaning: for he is giving the reason, why Faith is not wrought in all those, that have the Gospel; which is this: because they do not hear and learn, but stop their ears and refuse Gods gift.

The second sense therefore is this: That any man is able outwardly to hear the Gospel, is the gift of God by nature, in whom we live and move, and are. This, I think, he means. But First, this is not proved by his text out of the Proverbs, *The hearing ear and the seeing eye, the Lord hath made even both of them.* For as God did frame the earth, and yet the earth doth bring forth fruit of her self, the blade, the ear, and the corn; Mark 4. 28. So may man hear the word of God, and see the Moon and Stars, of himself, though God did frame both the hearing ear, and the seeing eye.

K

And

And secondly, the pretended Orthodox, who are thought by some, too much to denie free-will, did never yet denie that man hath free-will to natural, and moral actions, and religious too, though not in a spiritual manner, untill he be regenerate. Therefore to say, as here he doth, that man hath not ability of himself to hear outwardly, is a note beneath Gammoth, and a great deal more than needs, whatsoever the matter is, that he stoops so low. But seeing he goeth so far in denying free-will, I hope he will never be so fierce, as some have been before him; who, for the Semi-Pelagian objected to them, have returned roundly the Sesqui-Manichean; with somewhat more rage, than reason: The Manicheans did indeed deny free-will: but how, *quoad naturam, sive radicem liberi arbitrii*, according to the very nature of it, or free choice, which is essential to man. 2. to evil. 3. before the fall: this was the Manichean. Whereas the Pelagian affirmed, *vires liberi arbitrii*, the power or strength of mans will to good after the fall. And who they be that claim kindred more or less, to each of these is an easie matter to judge and determine. But thirdly, overmuch courtesie and condescension, do always give some cause of suspicion: yet I proceed no further, than to suspicion, or conjecture. He who can, upon quitting the point of free-will, gain in exchange the point of Universal Grace, may think himself no looser, having found out a way to corroborate the title of Universalist, which is thought now, well worth

worth the owning and affecting. We know who it was of old time, who talked much of Grace, but when it came to be explained it was nothing but Nature. To hear outwardly, is by nature: to hear inwardly is by grace, both of these, are in this Answer, called, both alike, without any difference, Gods gift: And as far as we may guess by his words, here, and in other places, both of them are of like extent, thus far, that look where God giveth the outward hearing, he giveth the inward hearing also. Now though it should be granted, that Grace may possibly be Universal, and bestowed upon all men, and yet be grace still, and that it doth not consist in being a Priviledge vouchsafed to some onely; yet how *universal* soever it be, it cannot be universal *Grace*, unless it be superadded to Nature, and natural endowments. Gods Grace is always beside, or, over and above humane nature.

Barely to hear, is not Grace but nature, so is it to live and move, with inward attention to hear, is not universal, but belongeth to internal vocation, which is the special Grace of God, opening the ears and inclining the heart to hear and obey. So that from the power of hearing, can no way be made good, Universal Grace.

---

“ Qu. 256. *Is it possible then for a  
“ man that hath beleevved, to fall from his  
“ Faith, and so from Grace?*

“*A.* Yes surely, if it be not well  
 “rooted in his heart, & the heart there-  
 “by kept single for God, and fruitfull  
 “in good: but where these things are,  
 “no danger of falling.

He that would rightly answer this Question, of falling from Faith, as I think, should first distinguish true justifying faith, from false, unsound, and temporary faith: and not speak of these two, as if they were all one, as in this Answer is spoken.

Such a faith as is feigned and unsound, may be lost: but true faith, that is of a right kinde, is not lost. Our blessed Saviour hath learned us this difference, and taught us this Doctrine, Matth. 13. vers. 21, 23. True faith hath rooting, and is fruitfull, and abideth. False faith hath no rooting, is unfruitfull, and endureth not.

This therefore, may well be added, and inserted into his Answer. Such faith from which any man doth fall, was never true faith, even while he did stand therein. The temporary beleever had no root before he withered: and the foolish virgins took no oyl with them from the first, and the house that fell, had no good foundation, before it fell, and therefore did it fall.

The Apostles speaking of Apostates, do usually put a difference presently after, betwixt them, even whiles they stood, and true beleivers; lest true beleivers should take offence, and be discouraged, and

suspe



suspect themselves to be in no better condition, than those revoltors were whiles they continued. This may appear by these places following.

2. Thessal. 2. Having spoken of the fearfull judgements of God, upon such as should be seduced and perish, for want of love to the truth, he addeth vers. 13. *But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, because he hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation.*

2 Tim. 2. *Hymeneus and Philetus* fell into a heresie: drew others along with them. *Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure; and, the Lord knoweth who are his,* vers. 19.

Hebr. 6. having largely described the cursed estate of those that totally and finally fall away in five verses, from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup>, he addeth v. 9. *But beloved we are perswaded better things of you and things that accompany salvation.* As if he had said thus: We do not onely think that you are now in better state than they are, but that you will always abide so. Though it might be but perswasion of charity, that these were so qualified: yet is it matter of certainty, that true grace, wheresoever it be, doth accompany Salvation: not onely cometh near, as neighbouring, or bordering upon it; nor yet as contiguous onely, for so it may fall short: but it is so contiguous with salvation, that it is withall, coherent with it, dependent on it, not to be severed: yea continuous with it, in one un-interrupted piece, or progress. It is such kinde of Grace, in which Salvation is wrap-

ped, and folded up, and contained, as the bird in the egg: As the several ages of man, infancie, youth, manhood, do differ one from the other, and do follow one the other, yet withall they are the same life still continued, although in differing degrees. Joh. 5. 24. *He that beleeveeth hath everlasting life*, if he that beleeveeth hath life, and that life be everlasting, then a beleever cannot fall away.

Hebr. 10. two last verses. *If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that beleeve to the saving of the soul*: to beleeve, and, to draw back; these two, are contrary, and inconsistent, as salvation and perdition are.

2 Pet. 2. 22. When he had shewed the dangerous estate of some, who had turned from the way of righteousness, and were again entangled in the pollutions of the world, after they had escaped them, he concludeth: *But it is happened to them according to the true Proverb; The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire*. His meaning is, though they were washed and reformed outwardly, yet they still remained what they were: they still retained their old unclean disposition: and their nature continuing, caused this return. A sheep differs from a swine newly washed: so differs a true convert from a false.

Joh. 2. 19. *They went out from us, but they were not of us*, and chap. 5. 9. after that he had mentioned

tioned the sin unto Death, the worst kinde of Apostacy of all, he addeth: *We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not*: still making a difference, betwixt true beleevers and Apostates before their falling away.

---

“ Qu. 272. *Thou saidst thou wert bound by thy Baptisme, to keep Gods holy will and Commandments; and walk in the same all the days of thy life; Tell me what is the will and Commandment of God concerning thee?*

1 Tim. 2. 4.

“ A. Gods will is, that I should be saved, and come to the acknowledgment of the truth.

*Will* is sometime *Command*: thus the Princes will and command is, that the Rebels lay down their arms by such a day. *Will*, is sometime *Intention* and purpose: thus the Princes will and purpose is, to pardon and receive to favour those that do lay down their arms by such a day. In this case, to keep the Princes command, is good sense: so is it not, to keep the Princes intention or purpose.

That God doth will, or intend and purpose to save all men, howsoever it be understood, is matter of belief, not of practise: therefore not of precept, and therefore not to be kept, or done. Whereas to *keep*, is to *observe* and do, as to keep the command-

men's, *Matth.* 19. 17. to keep the whole Law, *Jam.* 2. 10. I think it is no sense, and therefore can be no truth, to say, That we vowed in our Baptisme, to keep Gods holy Intention, that all men, or each man respectively, should be saved.

How much better a transiſion, then this, do we finde in the Church Catechiſme? *You ſaid, you did promiſe in your Baptiſme to keep Gods holy Commandments: Tell me how many there be? Ten, &c.* So that the meanest capacity underſtood that queſtion, far better without this answer, then with it

As for the Text, *1 Tim.* 2. 4. *God will have all men to be ſaved, & to come to the knowledge of the truth:* it may be thus explained: *S. Paul* ſheweth there the reason, why at that time kings and worldly powers were to be prayed for, more than in former times, becauſe God now intended to enlarge the limits of his Church, and ſhew mercy to all the world, excluding no nation or people. And as it was more ſuitable to Gods nature, who is a Spirit, to be worſhipped in ſpirit and truth, *Joh.* 4. and not as before Chriſts coming, in outward rites, ſhadows, and ceremonies, which then bare a great part of Gods ſervice; So was it more agreeable and conſonant: That where-as there is one God, Creatour of all mankind, there ſhould be now acceſs to him for all people, by one Mediatour, and not for one nation onely as heretofore. And becauſe this cannot be done ſo well, not quietly and peaceably, unleſs Kings and earthly Potentates embrace the Chriſtian faith; Therefore eſpecially

especially must they be prayed for.

So that Gods *will*, in this place, is not his *command*; and *to be saved*, is matter of reward, not of work; a reward which he bestoweth on us, not a work which he commandeth us to do. And to come to the knowledge of the truth, is not to beleieve, but to be made partakers of the Gospel, by publication: The which was joyned indeed with a command or charge to his 'Apostles, to preach the Gospel; but no command there was to the Nations to receive it, untill it were brought them, and they did come to the knowledge of it.

But may the universalists now say: If it be indeed the will of God, that *all* that hear the Gospel should be saved: Then is not salvation limited to some onely, called the *Elect*.

To this I answer, by putting them in minde, of what I suppose they have often heard. Gods *will* is twofold: 1. *Revealed, and Conditional*; thus he willeth all men to be saved. 2. *Secret and absolute*; so he willeth onely a few to be saved. If they cannot understand how he should will things thus contrary one to the other, let them help themselves with this similitude. A Nobleman, Landlord to many decayed tenants deeply endebted to him, willeth them to pay what they ow him, otherwise to be ejected. To some few of them, formerly his menial servants, he sendeth secretly supplies, and enableth them to discharge their arrears: against the rest the law passeth. The Landlords will now is, that all his tenants

tenants should pay their rents, enjoy their houses and lands as formerly, and that none of them should be dispossessed, or emprisoned. And it is his will also, that a few of his tenants should certainly hold possession, though most of them be cast out: of these two, the first will is conditional, upon their performance, and payment: the second is absolute, because accompanied with his power and purse, and grounded upon his own performance. If this be right, and reason, and plain to be understood; then let them not say, that we denie the Scripture-saying, *God willeth all men to be saved*: and let them give us leave to say withall, that he doth not *absolutely* will all men to be saved, because he doth not by his Almighty arm, rescue all men out of the bands of infidelity, in which by their own fault they are fast held.

---

Qu. and Answ. 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300.

It is observed of some men, that in disputation: and of many men, that in discourse, they will be sure soon to winde themselves into that point where their skill lyes. Our Authour in his six last Questions and Answers, returns thither where his zeal lyes, and where he is never found long time non-resident. This zeal he sheweth, not in giving his adversaries a parting blow, but, as I may say, in storming them, having before given them onely some easie assaults.

faults. And, as in a fray is usual, he taketh up that which cometh next to hand, to strike, and to lay on withall; though no way fitted, though never intended for any such purpose. And rather then he will suspect his own confidence, he will censure wel- nigh all Christians (the generality almost, so he saith Qu. 297.) as if they were false worshippers, unbelievers, and void of true religion, because they refuse what he tenders them, that may presently turn their dross to silver, and their shadows to solidity and substance. Among other things, he saith, *they give God the lie* ] words with which it pleaseth the holy Ghost to aggravate the hainous and sacrilegious sin of wilfull infidelity, of denying Christ made known, to whom God the Father gave so manifold testimony; but are not lightly to be taken up against every false opinion, much less in defence of any error. He saith, *They make void Gods grace, and Christs death.* ] This is truly said of such as persist in their unbelief, rejecting the Gospel being offered, and refusing to be baptized. He needed not to have spoken more hardly of them, had they renounced their Saviour, and turned to Mahomets belief.

“ They are very zealous, (he saith) but their Religion and Devotion, are abominable in Gods sight, and most horrible impieties. ] He hath left nothing wherewithall to expresse the worst that is in them, when their best is thus bad.

“ They multiply services without knowledge,  
“ and

“and offer the sacrifice of fools, they miss of Gods  
 “promises, and seek after him, but finde him  
 “not, because they seek him by the works of  
 “the Law, endeavouring to establish their own  
 “righteousness. ] As if it were all one to him  
 to speak what is true, and to speak what he  
 knoweth to be false, when he is in hot pursuit of his  
 adversaries.

But I have now paid that small debt, which I  
 might seem to ow, as vvell to them that desire to  
 learn, and not to be abused; as to others, vvho love  
 to be deceived rather than be taught. The vvords  
 of *Salvian*, though touching another subject, shall  
 serve me for my Caution, and for my Conclusion.  
*De Gubern. Dei*, lib. 1. *Sed de his dicendum amplius*  
*non est: tanta quippe est majestatis sacre & tam tre-*  
*menda reverentia, ut non solum ea quæ ab illis contra*  
*religionem dicuntur horrere; sed etiam quæ pro religione*  
*nos ipsi dicimus, cum grandi metu ac disciplina dicere*  
*debeamus:* that is, It is best to say no more concern-  
 ing these matters; because so great and so dreadful  
 is the sacred Majestie of God, that vve must ne-  
 onely detest vvhat others do utter against our reli-  
 gion; but vvhen vve speak in defence of our reli-  
 gion, vve must be very vvary that it be done vvith  
 greatest avvfulness and fear, vvith all the reverence  
 and regard that may be.



## Postscript.

**W**Hatsoever the exception be in particular, against what I have done, I foresee one in the general, that may be taken, and must now be satisfied; and it is this: There are two Editions of this Catechisme: One in the year 1654, the other in the year 1656. What I have written is upon the former: whereas it might have seemed more ingenuous to have dealt with the latter, containing second thoughts, & some alteration. This is the Objection. My Answer now followeth. It was the first Edition onely that was brought and put upon me, having not so much as heard of any second, untill I had wellnigh gone thorow with the observations here tendred. Secondly, the first was published, and is extant, and in the hands of many, who will not be very ready, so long as they have one, to enquire after another of the second impression. Thirdly, how far this allegation may be pleaded by him, who told us that which hath been noted once before, "There was nothing in the first Edition, but what might look his worst adversaries in the face, I leave to himself to be considered. And lastly, How little the alteration is, & how the difference is not very material, especially as to the chief points of Heterodoxy, and how the Retraction none at all, I leave to others to be considered. For as when we have once acknowledged the Truth, and never so much as once denied it, there lieth no obligation upon us, that we should at all times make confession of it: So an Error or Errors once divulged and spread abroad, are not sufficiently recalled by silence and omission, but remain the Authours own, till something more be done, and it is well if then the danger ceaseth.

FINIS.

T  
Sinf  
Tree  
The  
Head  
The  
Profe  
Order  
God  
Jesu  
All  
Elect  
Elect  
Elect  
Jacob  
Phara  
Vessel  
Work  
Rahab  
False  
Reme  
Reason  
Signes  
How  
No m  
Fallin  
Gods  
Conclu

# The Table.

<b>T</b> He Preface	Pag, 1.
Creators	P. 12.
Sinfull lusts	P. 14.
Tree of knowledge	P. 16.
The Prepared Sacrifice	P. 19.
Head of the Church	P. 26.
The Law	P. 33.
Professours to break bread	P. 48.
Order of the Dead rising	P. 59.
God had power enough	P. 51.
Iesus Christ died for all	P. 53.
All in Adam pardoned	p. 61, &c.
Election, what it is	P. 69.
Election in beleev'ing	P. 79.
Election in personal considerations	P. 80.
Jacob and Esau	P. 86.
Pharaoh	P. 91.
Vessels to honour and dishonour	P. 93.
Works speak Christs Mediation	P. 99.
Rahab and Cornelius	P. 106.
False Conceptions: four Instances	P. 108.
Remedy must be general	P. 115.
Reasons why it ought to be so	P. 115.
Signes of Gods Love	P. 127.
How Faith is wrought	P. 136.
No man can hear of himself	P. 142.
Falling from Faith	P. 146.
Gods will that all should be saved	P. 150.
Conclusion	P. 154.

FINIS.

D

c

I

DIGNISSIMO VIRO  
AC DOMINO

OMNIGENA VIRTUTE CLARO  
MULTIS QUE NOMINIBUS  
HONORANDO,

D. CAROLO MORDAUNT,  
BARONETTO,

Hoc quicquid est conaminis  
in receptæ Fidei vindiciis  
Grati animi

&

Debitæ observantiæ tesseram

L. M.  
D. D. C. Q.

JOSEPHUS HACON,



get a  
wise  
qua  
ling  
still  
befo  
som  
to ag  
Let  
and  
plea  
you,  
that  
not i  
artifi  
ities  
brase  
ield

¶ To the Reader.

**I**O you it is, when all is done, and to you alone, to whom we must make our applications and addresses, if we desire to obtain an equal hearing. And to that purpose, though we know not your character and disposition, yet do we presume that you are good and courteous; likewise that you are sound in the faith, able and well qualified, and not onely able, but which is more, willing also to give righteous judgement. Hence it is that we still appeal to you, and bring our matters controverted before your bar, and while we differ in other things, sometimes more perhaps then need is, yet we never fail to agree in this, to refer all to your final sentence, saying, Let the Reader judge. And because it must be thus, and cannot possibly be otherwise, I pray you be well pleased withall, if I now briefly put you in mind, and tell you, for your own sake as well as mine, what that is that you are to judge and pass your censure upon: It is not whether party of the two goes beyond the other in artifice and subtilitie, or is of the better parts and abilities, or the more ready and expert in wielding the brasen shield: if this be it that is contended for, I yield it now, and give it gone, not having so much art

## To the Reader.

and learning as some men have, to deliver things manifestly untrue, corrupt and irrational, and when they are found to be such, presently to cast about for mists and muffles, wherein to involve my self, and pass away undiscerned; so that my admirers, if any I had, should nevertheless admire and follow me still. And because I think I durst not do it, and am sure I ought not, I am very well content that I cannot do it. But the Question that you are to look after is, on which side the Truth is, and such truth as much concerns you, for most of those things we strive about, it is needfull for you rightly to understand and know, lest you be drawn aside into a wrong way, upon pretence of taking a nearer, or a better way. Yea, the main Controversie is, concerning the meaning of certain clauses in your Fathers Will and Testament; and these too, touching your heavenly inheritance, what your claim and title is to life eternal, and how you hold it: Whether God or man, Grace or Nature, doth begin and finish Faith and Salvation. So that it concerneth you, as much as it concerneth either of the parties litigant, that you be marie and judge aright: and I pray you remember, what you know already, that the best cause doth not always fall to the fiercest pleader, nor to him that useth most words. My Adversary Mr. Horn, seemeth to be of this mind; That any argument though never so slender, or answer though never so sleighty, any evasion, albeit most frivolous, will serve the turn, and do well enough, so they be well set on, namely with clapping hands and houting. And many of the weaker sort, when they perceive him



## To the Reader.

not onely to be earnest and importunate, but to wax hot and moody; are resolved to beleeve there is something in that which he saith, though they know not what it is: And rather than they will put themselves to the trouble of weighing with due attention what is said on each side, they choose to think, whatsoever is said by way of Answer, though it be meerly delusory, to be Answer sufficient: and supposing no good man will complain for nought, they judge it rightfull to assist and favour the wronged party. And because at all times they finde it a more easie and pleasing work, to be moved and warmed in their affections, then to be informed in understanding and knowledge; you can hardly perswade them to the contrary, but that faithfulness and the best Religion, are lodged under that which they call Zeal, though oftentimes it be little else, but noise and clamour.

He that hath perused the Answer, that this Reply of mine is directed to, cannot but observe one custome or manner of the Authour, not proper indeed to him, yet wherein he doth exceed and out-go others his like: when he should answer an objection, and make good his own Doctrine against my Exceptions, he is wont to omit the chief strength of the proof, reason or authority, and catching hold of some word or clause, some expression or other, upon that to spend his time, and sometime his anger, though that word or expression be so far impertinent, as it might have been left out, and the charge or exception have been valid nevertheless, even as valid without it. This dealing of his so frequent, hath called to minde that which Erasmus somewhere relateth

## To the Reader.

of a certain wealthy citizen, who having promised to a German Doctour a good sum of money in reward of his diligent attendance and fidelity in the cure of a contagious disease; being recovered and grown sound again, was nothing so forward to perform, as he was free to promise; but having passed the danger, bethought himself how he might mock the Saint. The first time that he saw him, he put him off with fair words; the next, with foul: for meeting him in the street, after many words and sharp contest arising about the Non-payment, at last not knowing how better to come rid of him, he took sore offence at his putting THOU upon him, which yet soundeth not alike in all languages, Vah homo Germanus, Tuistias me? so shaking his head, and using threatening speeches, away he flung in a great fume, and thus the matter ended. Though M. H. my adversary doth somewhat resemble this wealthy citizen, and be of their number who hold chiding to be the cheapest satisfaction; I hope, you my Reader, have so much skill in difference of coin, as to joyn with me, while I cannot acknowledge cavilling and exclaiming to be currant pay. To accuse in generals, is thought not to be fairly done, and I must not now make any stay upon instances; yet this I will say, I was much discouraged, and somewhat provoked with his trifling allegations, and picking holes in stead of hitting blots, so vainly and loosely for the most part, that I hope you do not expect I should insist upon every particular that he hath put upon me, because I think there is no man, yea though he had nothing else in the world to do, but must needs  
be

## To the Reader.

unwilling to go thorow with so tedious an employment: And yet when I pass by his objections and exceptions, such as they are, taking no notice of them; I am afraid those Lay-men that he speaketh of pag. 102. that cannot read Latine, and yet could see the faults of my arguings, when they shall come and here espie moreover the want of my answerings, will verily beleeve, that I am quite put to silence in the respective particulars, and can finde out nothing to say in behalf of my self, but am at Dulcarnon, right at my wits end; I must therefore desire you to remember, that if I have omitted any thing, it is not because I thought it could not be answered; but because I thought it needed no answer, or else deserved none, trusting that you, my reader, will compare what is said on each side, and satisfie your self. So will I here take my leave of you, rather than I will seem either to misdoubt, or any further to prevent your observation.



S  
ten  
ur,  
ch  
id p  
Tide  
on  
east.  
e m  
be V  
on l  
het



## CHAP. I.

*Touching the Epistle.*

IF beginnings be ominous, as they are held to be, then may I presage at the very first what I shall finde in that which followeth; for with these words you break into your discourse:

“ Mr. *H.* observes a wrong method,  
 “ he condemns me as an *Interpolator verita-*  
 “ *tis* ( Title-page ) a Huckster of the truth,  
 “ before he brings in any proof or evidence.

Sentences prefixt in title-pages are not to be taken with any strict or rigorous application: your self, Sir, have now set down five severall ones, there; each do intimate much worse against me, before you had prove they were applicable to me; and your very Title proclaims my Notes to be *Mistakes*, before you give in any evidence that they were such, at least, in the Readers order, and the progression that we must make. This is just as if you should blame the Vintner, for hanging forth his ivie, when as yet you have not tasted his wine; or before you know whether it comes not so near to vinegar, that after  
 the

the old quip of *Palladas*, a bunch of Lettice, or other Sallet-herbs, may not better become the sign-post. According to your new method, which you yourself follow not, he that writes a book, must place the Title of it there where *FINIS* is wont to stand, for when he hath concluded, we will suppose that he hath made his Title and his promise good. But Titles, as I take it, are usually impressed last. As also Prefaces and Epistles, though they be placed first, are yet taken to be composed then, when the work is done.

---

“ *Pag. 1.* Articles of Religion, must  
 “ not be injurious to the Churches growth  
 “ or her members, by tying them to the  
 “ measure already obtained ]

By the growth and measure you speak of, you do not mean more clear illumination, in respect of the minde, or evident belief, which is called Gradual Revelation: for that is no way hindered by tying Christian people to Articles and forms of Confession: But I finde where your trouble lyeth; you are for Doctrinal Revelations, which are in regard of the object, or things revealed; as if there were some points of our Confession that had no certainty, and some others that being not commonly known, are not yet received into it, which may hereafter be found needfull to be beleaved, as Ch

liafme

lisme, or Christs temporall kingdome, and many other old lights that might again be set up new, if once the people could be brought to forget those terms of prejudice, *Donatist, Anabaptist, Pelagian.*

---

“ We had not as yet had our Articles  
 “ and Catechismes, if Popish Articles had  
 “ not been broke through, or gone beyond.

Because Articles and Confessions were once abused, must they not now be made use of? *Simile est mater erroris.* The *Anabaptists* thought they must needs oppose *Luther*, as much as *Luther* opposed the Pope: How shall the people ever come to be grounded and rooted in the Faith, if they be taught to think that they are still upon uncertainties, no otherwise than they were before the Reformation?

---

“ I fear the late Synod went more from  
 “ the English Catechisme, than mine hath  
 “ done by far, especially in the points the  
 “ Reviewer sticks at.

Here you make divers Parallels, namely, betwixt the Church-Catechisme, that of the Synod, and your own. But I have not yet made any collation or comparison, betwixt the Assemblies Catechisme

chisme and any other: And I think there is no comparison to be made, betwixt so great a number of men so well qualified (whatsoever their Authority was) pretending to walk in the beaten path of the reformed Churches, And your self, being but one singular person, without any colour of Authority, professing to forsake the common road. And he that readeth the Title-page of your Catechisme, and observeth what points you there promise to lay open; would think that you ought in fair dealing to have made the nine and thirty Articles your Standard, and rule of comparison: for *They* contain the established Doctrine of the Church of England touching those controverted points: but in the childrens Catechisme, nothing is laid down purposely concerning them, because it was not thought, although you think so, that they did surmount the capacite of children. Yet because you seem to appeal to the English Catechisme, as making much for you, I am willing to deal with you there, and thither we will go: Although I expect you should evade and shift off all that can be brought against you out of it: or else flie off from it, as not obliging you in all things, but onely in some things that you approve: And these two, I reckon to be much alike. I know little difference in this matter betwixt you, who think that Confessions which are to be subscribed unto, be prejudicial to Christs growth and libertie; and others, whosoever they be who make confessions and articles *useless*, by opposi-



sing and eluding their manifest meaning. Out of the Church-Catechisme I propound to you two arguments in brief, against your common Doctrine. The first out of these words, *The holy Ghost sanctifyeth all the elect people of God.* Where is taught, that Gods Spirit sanctifyeth those that be elected; elected first, and then sanctified. You teach quite otherwise, [that God electeth those that are sanctified; chooseth the godly man, (as you wrest the Psalm,) and those that beleeve, and that are called, that is, engrafted into Christs mystical Bodie, and you cannot finde where the Uncalled are said to be elected.] Secondly, the English Catechisme teacheth the scholar thus, That he *is not able to serve God without his special Grace:* and he that hath learned this lesson well, will never be brought to answer to the name Universalist, or beleeve he can do it by Universal Grace. So here is no accord in the points we stick at.

---

“*Self. 3.* His third page utters this uncharitable slander of me, that I dread and deprecate all national establishment of Religion, as sanguinary persecution. Reply: ’Tis false. That God establish his true Religion in this Nation, I pray for, and neither dread nor deprecate. Is there no way to build up Sion, but by blood, or to serve Religion, but by sanguinary persecution?”

- “secution? for the Nation to establish  
 “Religion is a kinde of ἀκυεσλογία, an im-  
 “proper speaking. ]

Here you begin your game, to play on both hands; you say no such matter, and yet you justify it: you seem to be very angry, and yet you seem not to be in earnest, when you thus make sport with the word *all*, which might as well have been by me left out, and your charge had been as full without it. When I said, *all establishment*, I meant not, as you might well think, all both Humane, and Divine; but my intent was to note, that you mislike the establishment, even of that Religion, which you do now like well and profess: The Door must be left open, lest any Truth be in danger to be shut out, though some errors in the mean time enter, that so the growth of Christians be not hindered, as you said euen now. When the Supreme power of any Nation establisheth Religion in that Nation, this is National establishment; and if it be the true Religion, then doth God nationally establish it. What *you* mean by Gods establishment of the *true Religion* in a Nation, I know not, unless it be a liberty for every one to beleieve and profess as he will, without restraint. But this is an improper speaking indeed, ( 1 ) to call this the *true Religion* which is schisme; and ( 2 ) to call it *establishment* which unsettleth all things, and introduceth a contentious wildness,

- “ Endeavouring onely by instruction,  
 “ conference, and other spiritual weapons  
 “ to convince and further one another in  
 “ the truth, and keep out error.

Your counsel comes too late, after that it hath  
 for many years been weighed and tried, and found  
 too light upon the scales, and too pernicious to the  
 Church of God, and his true Religion nationally  
 established. Experience hath taught us, by what  
 we have seen, how much good is like still to be  
 done by the edge of spiritual weapons onely: there  
 is little hope of silencing such persons as have a fa-  
 ltie of a maladie called *λογοςμαχία*, *Multum loqua-*  
*tes, & dicentes nihil*, that say nothing, and yet can-  
 not hold their peace. The Devils scholars are like  
 himself, who being twice repulsed by our Saviour,  
 upon him the third time, and would not leave him  
 till he was commanded away, and bid be gone,  
 by way of Authority. To dispute with an obsti-  
 nate heretick, keeps him in breath and exercise, and  
 he falls that he takes upon the ground, do but  
 stop to recover his strength. Think you the Ger-  
 man *Anabaptists*, would have been charmed with  
 instructions, and conquered with your conferences?  
 Is true some few of them might, and were so:  
 therefore it is good to use both kinde of weapons;  
 the spiritual onely, as you advise. When the  
 Apostle *Paul*, gave order to *Titus* that the hereticks  
 should be stopped, *chap. i. v. 11.* he meant

not by conviction of argument onely it should be done, and endless discourse, but by suspension and censure: therefore in the third chapter ver. 10. They must have but a first and second Admonition, no more, and then be rejected. And in a Christian State, if the censure spiritual be not backed and seconded by the temporal arm, the wanton and profane ones of the world, will count it but as stubble, and the shaking of this spear contemptible. If this be the onely way you can think of, to keep out error, I pray keep this your error to your self.

---

“ Under pretence of establishing Religion, to compell all men to beleieve  
 “ profess and practise the same things  
 “ whether God hath revealed it to them  
 “ or not; and for not doing so, though  
 “ otherwise sober, pious and peaceable, to  
 “ persecuting and punishing them, and  
 “ pressing and binding burthens of humane  
 “ ceremonies and traditions, and so exercising  
 “ a lordly Domination in the Church  
 “ of God, is such beastly doing, under pretence  
 “ of Church-power, that I pray God  
 “ enlighten all mens eyes to see the mistake  
 “ and mischief of it,

As for the case of compulsion in matters of faith; you know (though you be content

that others should understand it otherwise, before whom you declaim against settling of Religion ) that the Question among us, is not about compelling Strangers, *Jews, Turks, or Americans* to a new belief; but of compelling people to conform to their own laws agreed upon: Every mans consent is involved in every Law that is made; so that Law being enacted for the uniformity of Religion, if any man suffers, he suffers not injuriously, but by his own consent: Clergy-men especially, whose consent is more expresse than any other mens is.

*Tertullian* is often alledged, as speaking against constraint in Religion; but it is there where he leads the Christians case against the *Ethnicks* in his *Apologetick*, and to *Scapula*: But in the Church no man more fervent for Discipline than he is, and where he deals against hereticks, as in his *Corpiaco*, or Antidote against the *Gnosticks*, where his words are these, cap. 2. *Ad officium hereticos compelli, non illicitum dignum est, duritia vincenda est, in suadenda*: that is, It is fit that hereticks should be compelled, not allured to do what they should, and being obstinate, they are not to be perswaded, but subdued.

Though otherwise sober, pious and peaceable] this is as much as if you should say, quite contrary to what our Saviour saith, *Matth. 7. 15.* Take heed of false teachers, let them alone, do not hinder them, nor molest them, though they be ravening wolves, so they come to you in sheeps clothing.

Your qualities of *Sober, Pious, Peaceable*, (in our  
ward shew, and further we cannot judge) are the  
sheeps clothing, under which Sectaries are wont to  
shroud themselves, that they may infect others be-  
fore they be discerned. What *Tertullus* called *Paul*  
Act. 24. 5. a *Pestilence*, is true enough in *The*  
though misapplied to *Paul*; every Seducer is a very  
Pest, and therefore to be looked to that he spread  
not his contagion. And another may come and  
plead for Homicides, Traytours, false Coiners of  
money, that are otherwise pious and peaceable, as  
well as you plead for Seducers. But by the promi-  
sence of God, all mens eyes that will see, are open-  
ed to see the mischief of them.

- 
- “ That passage ( of my deprecating a  
“ nationall establishment of Religion ) pe-  
“ haps was one of those passages, that in  
“ letter to me he cryed *peccavi* in, and there-  
“ fore I forgive it, for as *Seneca* says,  
“ *Quem paenitet peccasse, penè est innocens*  
“ He that repents that he hath done amiss  
“ A faultless man almost he is,

There was very little likelihood that this should  
be one of the passages I meant: and I said no more  
of you then, than you now say of your self, nor  
much. He is ill advised that chooseth you for  
Confessors, who are so ready to cry it out wherefore

he cries *Peccavi* : for me, resolved I am, never to  
 out either wine or ought else, that is worth ought,  
 into that vessel that I perceive will hold no water.  
 But I am like to loose the benefit of *Seneca's* sen-  
 tence ; because it repenteth me that I made any  
 such acknowledgment , now that I see what use  
 you make of it, and what interpretation : and yet I  
 doubt not to salve my innocence well enough , be-  
 cause what I said was true , yet was spoken out of  
 your comfort, and not from conscience of a y wrong  
 did you, for I did you none, as I more perceive  
 now I am more acquainted with you.

---

*Sect. 4.* “ That phrase, *as may best serve*  
 “ *the capacity of children* , was not joyned  
 “ with the *great Mysteries* , but with what  
 “ went before-- But may not children learn  
 “ the great Mysteries ?

The instructions, by your Title, were in the first  
 place for children, though not unusefull for men al-  
 so : if you intended not that the great Mysteries  
 should be for the capacitie of children, why did you  
 direct the children at the end of your catechisme, to  
 recite the Answers to all the Questions by heart, some  
 the first time, some at the second ? your mean-  
 ing was clear, as if you had said , Because these in-  
 structions for children contain these great mysteries,  
 therefore they are not unusefull for men also.

Seēt. 5. " What more rise with them  
 " then the odious names of *Pelagian*, *Semi-*  
 " *pelagian*, *Arminian*, the *Enemies of God*  
 " *Grace*, and what not ?

These names may be odious to others, but they are not odious to you, or if the names be, the opinions are not; no, not the *Pelagian*. One of your party makes it *Pelagianisme*, to be offended with the Surplice; another faith, that the error of *Pelagius* was, that he held perfection in this life. I would gladly know, how you shift it off from your self; for I know no difference of any moment betwixt him and you in the main. He was an enemy to Grace no further than thus, that he held Grace was given to all sufficient to salvation, and that it was given according to mans works, will, and preparations. And whereas you joyn the *Semi-pelagian* and the *Arminian* together, I think you do *Arminius* no wrong: for every man knows his own minde best, and his minde you may know by his words, *Oper. p. 143. Adjunxi disquiri posse an Semi-pelagianismus non sit verus Christianismus.* I said indeed (saith he) it might be questioned, whether *Semi-pelagianism* were not the true *Christianity*: because *That* is as the *Mean*, (so he addeth) duly received from each extreme, namely, the *Pelagian* on the one hand, and the *Manichean* on the other: whereas I suppose *Semipelagianism* hath been taken therto to be a degree of one extreme, and not the



golden mean between the two extreems, any more  
 than the *Papist* is in the right between the *Jesuite*  
 and the *Anabaptist*.

*Seet. 6.* “ He says, Vote, and the Rule  
 “ of Gods word, may be not contrary but  
 “ subordinate: Reply. Be it so; yet would I  
 “ not walk by vote, but by the word stil,  
 “ though in walking by the word, I should  
 “ in that case walk with the vote. A man  
 “ that travelleth from *Lin* to *Aylesham*, may  
 “ go much of his way in *Normich* road, yet  
 “ he goes not in it because it is *Normich*  
 “ road, but because it is the way to  
 “ *Aylesham*.

The wisdom from above is first pure, then  
 peaceable: So may your Religion be, in the first  
 place, Pure; because it accordeth with Gods word:  
 and in the next place, peaceable, because it accord-  
 eth with the Churches Confession: But as you  
 handle the matter in your similitude of travelling  
 from *Lin* to *Aylesham*, you regard not the Church  
 at all, no, not in the least. But what if it be a mat-  
 ter of difficultie, that you know not what to think?  
 Will you not suffer the Churches Authority, being  
 put into the scale, to cast it on either side, so as to  
 make one part more probable than the other? Or  
 in matter of practice, you doubt whether you may

lawfully do, what you are by the Church enjoyned, will you not think it better to doubt, and obey, than to doubt and disobey? Or if it be in a matter of small consequence, wherein without all doubt, you think your self in the right, and others in error, will you not keep it to your self, rather than so to propound it, as to hazard the continuance of the Churches peace? If to these you answer, No, then you regard not much the Apostles charge: *To be of one minde*, Philip. 2.2. *To be perfectly joyned in the same judgement*, 1 Cor. 1.10. *To give no offence to the Church of God*, chap. 10.32. If all Protestants had been of your minde, the labour might have been spared, of putting forth the *Harmony of Confessions*, as being of very little use. When *Abram* commanded his children to keep the way of the Lord; and when *Joshua* undertook for himself and his household, that they should serve the Lord: had they of their several families been of your resolution, they might have returned this answer: We will serve the Lord, and keep his way, but not because you command us; for then Gods fear should be taught by mans precept, which must not be. God Almighty would not have given Ministers and Pastours for teaching and edifying his Church, if he intended them no more respect and authority than you seem willing should be given them.

In the Preface to your Catechisme, you would have your “ people not walk by Votē, because the  
 “ is to be taught by mens precepts ] said I again

The

They that learn a Catechisme framed by a single Pastour, are taught by the precept of man, as much as they that walk by the vote of an Assembly: To this you answer now, " That you suspend none " for not following you, neither do you enjoyn " your sayings by compulsive force. ] But this alters not the case at all. For that which is indeed superstition, is so, whether it be imposed by violence, and enforced, or whether it be voluntarily assumed and put in practice. Their Fear is taught by the precept of men, whose Religion is Superstition, consisting in wil-worship, and in observation of humane traditions and inventions. And what is this, to a Catechisme or Articles of Faith framed by an Assembly or a Convocation? You take up a Scripture-saying, before you have learned what it meaneth, and so the sound of it may serve your present purpose. You little consider in what principles you breed your scholars, and how you teach them to condemn all teaching, and the whole ministry of Gods word. And as for compulsion, for ought I know, you use all the force you can use, (which is not much.) Those who will not follow your directions, you will not encourage as your disciples; and this is as great force and violence within your narrow sphere, as that which is used in a larger compass.

---

*Seet. 7. pag. 7.* " While we are instructed  
" all of us not to have our fear toward God  
taught

“ taught by the precepts of men, we are  
 “ instructed to have all but one Faith, or  
 “ Creed, that is, the word of God, and not  
 “ to have our Faith like that of the Roma-  
 “ nists, depend on other men, to beleeve  
 “ onely implicitly, as the Church beleeves,  
 “ which is the thing I lead my parishioners  
 “ from.]

Three Symbols or Creeds were wont to be proof  
 sufficient of a good Christian and Catholick. You  
 here would have but one: and that one the word  
 of God, as every man shall differently understand it.  
 And I do not remember that ever I heard before  
 now, the word of God called a Creed. Because I  
 named Removers of land-marks that their fore-fa-  
 thers had set, you said I condemned you for such:  
 you seem now to acknowledge your self such: for  
 certainly, no limits there are of the Christian  
 Churches, if the Creeds be not. The implicit  
 Faith of the Romanists, is a Resolution and Pro-  
 fession to be of the Churches belief, though in the  
 mean time it be unknown what that is; An assent  
 in gross to all that the Church propoundeth to be  
 beleeved: and though Faith be in Scripture called  
 Knowledge; yet, say they, it is better defined by  
 Ignorance than by Knowledge. This implicit  
 Faith, being upon the matter nothing but a good  
 opinion we have of our teachers, may be a good  
 disposition or preparation to Faith, but Faith it self

it cannot be. And can your conscience suffer you to make the world beleeve, that when a Church shall compose a Confession of Faith, taking care the people be taught it, and exacting conformitie thereto, and imposing penalties upon such as shall depart therefrom; that this is onely the implicate Faith of the Romanists? Or to tell a good Christian that hath been instructed in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, who knows it and beleevs it to be the Truth, That it is a point of Popery to beleeve as the Church beleevs? I hope there are but few that will not soon discern the mischief, and the consequence, and the fallacy of such instruction.

---

*Seēt. 9.* “ I told you formerly, that you  
 “ used this word *all*, as a helve or handle,  
 “ wherewithall to cut down the trees of the  
 “ forrest. To this say you now; *Seēt. 9. An*  
 “ *acute charge, like helves or handles that use*  
 “ *to cut.* ]

I thought you might be so acute, as to take my meaning without my further rehearsal of the *Fable* that is so well known. A man that wanted a helve for his ax, came and begged one of a certain goodly wood or tuft of trees, promising to trim and prune them, & having obtained it, did therewithall cut the trees down to the ground. He could not cut them down without a helve, but with an helve or handle  
 he

he did it. For there is no remedy, but you must give us leave to put this particule[ *with* ] to any thing that is an instrument, whether conjunct or separate, or that is instrumental. He that felleth an oak, doth it with his arm, and with the strength of his arm, as well as with his ax. You write with your ink, and with your hand, and with your pen: he ploughman will tell you that he turns up the soyl with his oxen: and will you tell him again, that oxen do not use to turn up the soyl? Thus while you hunt after such minutes and minims as these are, and miss them too, thinking you have caught a flie, when it is but the shadow of it, you let pass the substance of the accusation which I brought against you, and that is this: You come to Scripture, and thence you take this word *all*, pretending by the help of that to preach the Gospel more sincerely, and more profitably than others generally do, running without their message: But you frame it, and stretch and wrench it in such a manner, that you corrupt and overturn the chief points of the Covenant of Grace. *Tertull. de Pudic. cap. 16. Est hoc solenne peruersis, alicujus capituli ancipitis occasione, adversus exercitum sententiarum instrumenti totius armorum:* that is, With one place, or sentence, or point of belief, that is of various and doubtfull acception, perverse men think themselves sufficiently armed and furnished, to oppose the greatest part of the Bible.

*Señt. 10.* “ I said, that we may not think  
 “ that *Luke* meant contrary to *Pauls* do-  
 “ ctine: That he fraudulently suppressed ]

Your discourse tending to accord the words of *Luke* with *Pauls* doctrine, because it was somewhat tedious and vain, as I thought it, and especially because it belonged to another place, I did onely note by the way in brief. But that you did in seeming-satisfaction to your self at least, make them agree well together, I did not omit to give notice in these words [ *though he thinketh he can reconcile them.* ] And when I said thus much, it is most evident, that I did not fraudulently suppress, what you did ; though I did not needlessly express how you did it. But when you said, *It is safer to stick to Paul than to Luke*, it was scandalously spoken of you, and an odious comparison : if you do indeed beleieve all holy Scripture to be divinely inspired, why should you prefer one writer of it before another ?

You appeal to me, Whether in case *Luke* doth disagree with *Paul* [ “ if it be not safer to  
 “ stick to *Paul*, who says, *If we, or an angel from*  
 “ *heaven preach any other Gospel than we have*  
 “ *preached, let him be accursed* ]

But the Apostle doth not make comparison betwixt himself and any other Apostle or pen-man of holy Scripture, for he joyns himself with them [ *if we* ] he sets not himself above others, but names himself together with others, the better to establish that

that Gospel, which he together with others had taught. Here is nothing of sticking to *Paul* more than to *Luke*, but of sticking to the doctrine once delivered, against any other doctrine that should be taught by any whosoever, upon what pretence soever imaginable.

---

*Seēt. 11.* “ May I not stick to his say-  
 “ ings, and yet say, they be hard to be un-  
 “ derstood ?

But when you answer the arguments brought against you out of such chapters, by saying, those chapters are hard to be understood; then you do *not stick to his sayings* so, as by them to be concluded, or to suffer an end to be put to the Controversie. That which is urged out of those places against the Universalists, is easie and evident: you make use of the difficultie of them, for an answer to put off and elude that which is plain and not obscure or difficult. The matters of doctrine delivered by *S. Paul*, may be hard to be understood, that is hard to be received, digested, and entertained, by loose unsettled persons: many difficulties and intricacies there may be, not easily cleared; shall this render the proof invalid, that such doctrines there are? If you should out of *S. Pauls* Epistles defend Justification by Faith against a Papist, you would not accept it for an answer, if he should say thus,

That



That is one of those things the Apostle *Peter* speaketh of, hard to be understood, which some hereticks have wrested towards libertie and profaneness, as if therefore there were no necessity of godliness or good works. The rejection of the Jews and calling of the Gentiles, The abolition of the Law of Moses, were matters hard to be understood by the Jews, and in which were many perplexities; yet were plainly delivered by the Apostle: The impossibility of Apostates repentance and renovation was plainly taught, yet attended with difficulties, and wrested by the *Novatians*: So is the final period of the world foretold in holy Scripture; yet are there many obscurities about it, and many errors. The Resurrection of the dead is fully and manifestly declared and confirmed; yet because it was hard to be understood and beleaved, it was wrested to this sense, as if it were already past, whether interpreted of rising from the death of sin, or any other way. These particular doctrines now by me named, are by divers diversly conjectured to be intended by *S. Peter*, as well as that doctrine to which you apply his words. Gods gracious and free Election, likewise final Perseverance, are evidently taught by the Apostle *Peter*, 1 Epist. ch. 1. ver. 2, and 5. as well as by the Apostle *Paul*, Rom. 8. 29, 30. and in the chief part of the ninth chapter. And because these things are hard to be yielded to, and hard to be received; and because there be many things belonging thereto that are secret

secret and unfathomable; let not therefore that which is plainly taught, be either denied, or in such a manner interpreted and perverted, that it amounts to a denial. You and yours have so gone to work, that to an ordinarie capacitie the chapter spoken of is made scarce intelligible. You say, God decreed not to choose particular persons, but to choose all such as beleve the promises of the Gospel, and to refuse all such as seek justification by works; whereas certainly had there ever been any such decree made, then *Paul* had never been chosen, who was a law-worker, as you call it. So were many of the jews and Pharisees, who yet were brought to life eternal. And whereas the Apostle teacheth Election and Salvation to be, *Not of man that worketh, willeth, or runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*; you have so wrested it, that now it is, Not of man that willeth or worketh, but of man that beleeveth, and continueth in Faith and Repentance to his lives end. And indeed, if Election be of such, *as such*, who persevere in Faith and Repentance, then is Election of workers, in respect of their works, namely, Beleeving and Repenting, and Persevering, which are works, all of them belonging to Gods law. And thus have you overthrow your own doctrine which you have devised, wherewith to overthrow the doctrine of *S. Paul*.

Str.  
in

*Seet. 12.* “ It is one thing to look boldly, another that it *may* do so. Humane frailties hinder not Christian boldness.

But he that saith, I may look boldly, doth therein  
withall, and in so saying, look boldly indeed. Now  
you made your book look boldly, whether it might  
do so or no, when you taught it to say in the Pre-  
face, that it might look your worst Adversaries  
boldly in the face. And although he that hath hu-  
mane frailties may look boldly, yet his humane frail-  
ties may not; and if he saith, they may; he doth then  
justifie his frailties. And thus much for your Pre-  
face or first Chapter.



## CHAP. II.

### *The word Creatours.*

“ I Shall put him in minde where he may  
“ read it, in *Ainsworth* upon Psal. 149.  
“ The Christian Churches never forbid us  
“ to read Eccles 12. 1. in the Hebrew  
“ tongue, or to turn it into English, ac-  
“ cording to its proper force or Idiome.

You have helped me where to finde the  
word in our *language*, but that it is found in our  
C Church.

Church, I cannot admit: for you know that *Ainsworth* was a professed Separatist from the Church of *England*. It was somewhat boldly done of him to turn it so, who yet in his Title professed to explain the Hebrew words; but it was far more boldly done of you, to learn the children at the very first to speak so. As you have helped me to the notice of one, so will I in lieu of him help you to the notice of another, whom perhaps you have not yet observed; or if you have, I dare say you never before took notice of one of his places, which he hath added to yours and *Ainsworths*. It is *Th. Beza of N.* in a small tract published last year. His fourth instance is in these words, Eph. 2. 12. *And ye were without Gods in the world, so it is in the Greek plurally but it is falsely translated God singularly, as if there were but one God in the Trinity.*] I hope there is a measure on this side the *Tridentine* Restraint, without such libertie as many men affect, who are afraid that they shall not be known, but pass in obscurity, and not be counted more learned and judicious than others are if they do not mend and alter something or other though it be without exception generally received and of long continuance. *Aeneas Sylvius* before he was Pope or Cardinal, or Bishop, was Secretary to *Frederick* the Emperour, and having indited some letters, at his first coming to the employment he sent the copy to a Bishop then living at the Court, who procured him that preferment, desiring him to examine it, and alter what he should find need

needed alteration; who soon after returned him again his copie, in sundry places blotted, but no way lettered, having put out divers words, here one and here another, placing such in their stead as were no way so fit and proper: and when the Secretarie asked him the reason, and what he misliked in those words that he thus corrected: *Atqui*, said the Bishop, *non vidisse me scripta tua suspectare poteras, si nihil immutatum reperisses*: you would have thought never read or perused your writing, had you received it again just such as you sent it to me. I could wish that those men who are forward to show their diligence, and their skill in the learned languages or perhaps their ignorance, as it hapned in the instance I now gave you) by mending the vulgar edition, would innovate in matters of less moment: these be indeed above any *profana vocum novitates*. I know it is one thing to teach that such a point of Faith is implied in such an Hebrew Idiom: another thing to teach children and common people to use the plural number, upon pretence of saving the Church to the Scripture. Christian churches forbid not to read *Eccles* 12.1. in Hebrew, yet they are against rendring every word, just as it is in that language, as their practice doth plainly witness. And would you indeed that the English Bible should begin in the same manner, and with the same pretence that you began your Catechisme with, *The Gods created heaven and earth*? I hope I would not; and yet you are in the way to it.

And though you teach your scholars at your fourth Question, to answer, *There is but one God*: yet if they be wonted to read or hear that word in the plural and be used so to speak, will they not go near to forget your Answer in your Catechisme, and think that there are more than one? *Bara Elohim* is the sacred Text, good Hebrew and sound Doctrine: But *Creavit Dii*, is scandalous, no true Doctrine, nor good Divinitie.

And because you think good to joyn with those that hold it not to be a bare Hebraism, but an incarnation of the Sacred Trinitie, I pray you to remember on the other side, 1. that the plural number implyeth two or four, as wel as three: so wholly it is but a matter of uncertaintie: 2. because you say here, is a scandal for Christians to *Judaize*, for so you are pleased to *Lutheranize*, if indeed you beleieve the God is called *Elohim*, because of the pluralitie of persons; then wheresoever that word be found though ascribed to one several person, it must signify the whole Trinitie, and then in stead of *Judaizing* you are in peril to fall into *Sabellianism*, or the error of the *Patropassians*. And for the common people, I hope they will be warie how they walk and how they speak in such points of Faith, as this is. And because it is a matter of consequence, and because the ground is slipperie, let them in Gods name lay fast hold upon the Athanasian Creed, beginning thus, *Whosoever will be saved*, for their guide and conduct; let them read it often, and be

with their best attention, and prefer it before all  
 Catechismes; much more before any new-fangled  
 one. There shall they soon learn by plain Analogie,  
 according to the Doctrine of the Scripture, and the  
 Doctrine of the Catholick Church, *That the Fa-  
 ther is Creatour, The Son Creatour, The holy Ghost  
 Creatour: yet are there not three Creatours, but one  
 Creatour.* And this may suffice for your second  
 chapter.



## CHAP. III.

*Sinfull lusts.*

THE Question is, Whether in those words of  
 the English Catechisme, [ *Sinfull lusts of the  
 flesh* ] the word *Flesh* signifieth created nature, as  
 you taught; or the corruption of nature, as I said;  
 making the epithet *sinfull*, serve onely to amplifie,  
 and not as you make it to distinguish. Here you say,  
*Be it so*; the matter is not material, it is to trifle  
 about a toy ] Yet I gave some reason why it was  
 requisite, that Christians young and old should un-  
 derstand the meaning of that term. Matter of  
 words is so far material, as to preserve what is mate-  
 rial; *Verba quasi vasa*, as the shell preserveth the  
 kernel, and the vessel keepeth what is put into it.  
 But though you say, *Be it so*; yet presently after,

it must not be so. “ *Sinfull* may be an epithet to  
 “ distinguish withall. Why so ? Because we are  
 “ taught to renounce, not the works of the Devil  
 “ onely, but the Devil also; why not also the other  
 “ two enemies, the world and the flesh ? ]

Those words of the Catechisme refer to Baptisme. In the form of Baptisme these three enemies are twice named, singly or solely, without any epithet or addition, namely, *Grant they may triumph against the Devil, the World, and the Flesh* also, *To fight under his banner against Sin, the World and the Devil.* ] By which two places compared together, any one that will may plainly see, what *Flesh* in the form of Baptisme, and in the form of the Catechisme doth signifie, namely, *Sin*: for what is called *Flesh* in one place, is called *Sin* in the other. And every one that will, may plainly see also, that you are resolved to uphold whatsoever you have said, yea, though it be an evident absurditie. The Question with the answer, you left out wholly in your later Edition: which when I perceived, I made some doubt whether or no I should take notice of it in my *Review*, because I did interpret the omission to be a kinde of confession of your mistake: yet did I note it for the reason given in my *Postscript*. But here you declare your self to be for *confusion* of signification, rather than a *nice distinction*: and what you threw out of your second edition, you call home for your relief in defence of your first: Neither are you well contented, as it seems, that ever



one should interpose or meddle, and mislike that which haply may deserve to be misliked. *Nemo sibi extraneus est; sicut in vulnere tractatione,* (saith *Julius Scaliger*) *Ossa mihi extraxi egomet minimo dolore:* No Chirurgeon can so inoffensively touch or handle a wound, or sore, or fracture, as the Patient can. And more than this I shall not say to your third Chapter.



## CHAP. IV.

*The tree of knowledge.*

**V**Hen upon the marginal note of your fourtieth Question and Answer, I mentioned that horrible error, as you well call it, *The Denial of Divine Prescience*, I did it so fairly and softly, that I thought I had not given any just cause of distaste or anger. I gave you account of my intention, in making stay at it. It was because the *Sociinians* had gone that way verie far, and some of the *Remonstrants* were following. I had some other reasons which I then kept to my self: but now my expectation thus failing me, you shall have them. One was, because there was a pestilent Sectarie, who to prove that God doth not know free actions before they come to pass, produced those words, *Gen. 2. 19.* God brought the beasts and fowls

to Adam, to see what he would call them: and because I thought your gloss upon the ninth verse of that chapter might unhappily help that error forward, namely, that it was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil, because God would trie whether man would do good or evil; I therefore endeavour'd to give the true reason why it was called the Tree of knowledge. And *Socinus* disproves Divine prescience from those words, *Gen. 22. 12. Now I know thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thine onely son:* and your explication of a place of the same kinde with these two, was likely to promote that pernicious error. Another reason was this; I did observe of you in your writings, that you do in a manner wholly symbolize with the *Remonstrants*, and in some things with the *Socinians*, as in these for instance. 1. In neglecting the authority, custome, and manner of the Church, upon pretence of walking onely by the Scripture-rule, witness the verie first Question of your Catechisme and, *Open door*, Preface, § *Of this*. You bid the people prefer the Apostles expressions before mens glosses: as here pag. 44. *you contented your self with the Scripture phrase, and used not that of the Church.* 2. In your opinion that Christs death was onely a Preparation to his Sacrifice. 3. *Ut fideles panem frangant*, are the words of their Catechisme; and *Professours to break bread* are the words of yours. 4. You hold with them, that Faith is wrought by no immediate power, but onely the word preached.

5. You

3. You would have the *Names* written in the book of life, to be *Qualities*; and Socinus, *Prælect.* 13. pag. 72. *Satis est eorum qualitatem quandam certam esse, quæ in hac metaphora proprio nomini planè respondet*: It is sufficient that those who are said to be elected, have some certain qualitie, which in this Metaphor of the book of life, plainly is answerable to their proper names. You who have gone so far with them or after them, are in danger to go further.

---

“ What irreligious principles they that plead for their libertie of will are forced to maintain, I know not.

That you might soon have seen by that which follows there. By *Their* libertie, I mean such libertie as they plead for, and such as cannot stand with certaintie of Prescience. Say they, For any one to exhort another to do that which he knoweth before hand he will not do, is to *dissemble*: such libertie as must be free not onely from coercion or compulsion, but from necessitie of infallibilitie as to the event: which necessitie is incident to things contingent and fortuitous: for events, necessarie, contingent, chanceable are called so, and differenced so, in respect of their second causes, not in respect of the first or supreme cause: for *Quicquid est, quando est, necessario est*: any thing that is, must needs be so, then when it is so. That *Saul*, after he was wearied

wearied with seeking up and down the countrey for his fathers cattel, should on such a day, and such an hour of the day, meet with the Prophet *Samuel*, was to *Saul* then when it came to pass, as certain as that the sun should set that night, or did rise that day, that is, it was most certain because it was present. But to God all things are certain and present that shall be; as certain to him though future, as to us though present. *Socinus* therefore was driven (and if he had not been driven and enforced to it, he would never have done it) to denie and impugne Divine Prescience, and that in order to denial of Divine Decrees, and to maintain, *Quod non est certum, non est scibile, nec futurum*: whatsoever comes to pass, and doth not certainly come to pass, is not capable of being known: no more than *factum infectum fieri* is capable to be done. And the *Socinians*, (in *Compendiolo*,) *Negant admissa infallibilis omnium futurorum præscientiâ, refelli posse dogma de Prædestinatione*: and whether they speak reason or no, *Ger. Vossius* can tell, whose words are these: *Hist. Pelag. c. 6. Th. 15. Nisi negare volumus Deum præscire quid homo pro quibusque circumstantiis facturus, fateri etiam COGIMUR Deum certis hominibus Gratiâ preparâsse, quâ certo & infallibiliter salventur: aliis verò hujusmodi Gratiâ non preparâsse*: that is, Unless we will say that God doth not foreknow what man will do, upon such and such circumstances, we cannot but of necessitie confess that he hath for some certain men prepared such

grace, whereby they shall certainly and infallibly be saved, and not prepared such grace for others. If Faith be Gods gift, and if he will give it to whom he will give it; this is that predestination which you endeavour what you can to fright the world withall. That therefore which you call in this chapter a horrible error, and I called an irreligious principle, you must fall to and defend by rational consequence, unless you give over your horrible and irreligious manner of reviling Gods decrees.

---

“ I fear this Gentleman is so far from  
 “ thinking that God did not know before,  
 “ that he thinks he decreed & necessitated  
 “ Adam to sin. Would I follow his course  
 “ in fastening upon him the sayings and  
 “ judgements of other men of his minde,  
 “ I might finde passages enough to that  
 “ purpose in many of them, to render him  
 “ and his opinions odious: but Mr P. hath  
 “ done it so fully, that I shall but *actum age-*  
 “ *re*, do what is done already; and therefore  
 “ I shall leave the Reader for that to him.]

Although I do think that you have more minde to slander than cause to fear, yet I will now tell you,  
 1. I do not beleeve God did decree sin: but I think you beleeve that he did decree the permission of sin:  
 2. In those things which are decreed to come to pass

pass, Gods decree inferreth no necessitie upon inferior causes or agents, because he decreeth all things to come to pass according to their kinde: natural agents to act naturally, voluntarie agents voluntarily: So of necessary, contingent, and casual agents, I pray suffer your self to be informed a little better by Dr. P. Baro, pag. 321. in explication of this position, *Dei Decretum pravae voluntatis libertatem non tollit*, Therefore I shall leave you for that to him. But if you have so much leasure as to trouble your self about others, and what it is that they think, and that you would not be afraid there where no fear is; I pray let all your fear in this matter be for them that call it [*A gross solecism* to imagine that there should be one cause of the act, and another of the obliquitie or sinfulness of the act; and that think it is as impossible to separate the wickedness of the act, from the act that is wicked, as it is to distinguish the roundness of the globe, from the globe that is round; So that he which is the Authour of the one, must be the Authour of the other also: yet the Apostle Paul said, *Acts 17. 28. In him we live and move*: Let it be for them who tell you it must be a *Metaphysical head* that can determine how God should work by evil instruments, and not be guiltie of the evil: and yet the Apostle said, *Acts 3. 18. He hath so fulfilled*. Let it be for them that think, he who withholdeth a thing which being present would hinder an event, is the cause of that event: and in whose power it is that a thing be not done, to

him

him it is imputed when it is done; and he that withdraweth the light, is the cause of that which followeth for want of the light.] And yet no man that hath his reason left entire to him; can imagine that the sun which is all light, having no darkness in it, can be the cause when it setteth, of the shadow of the night.

It is an easie matter to make any opinions seem odious to those men that are full gorged with prejudice against them. Every thing feeds according to the kinde and constitution: *Torva leana lupum sequitur*. I can tell of some, who in the doctrines of the Church of *England*, wherein they have been educated, have been verie much confirmed by the matter and the manner of some mens writings against them.

And as for those men that take such pains to make the opinions you speak of to be *odious*: I do wish, and if it might be, I would advise them, that they would at last forbear, and not please themselves in so odious a practise: whether these opinions be true or false, is uncertain; it is at least probable that they are the Truth, and upon these reasons.

*First*, because very many of these men, by their own confession, were of the verie same minde in these points of doctrine, and held that end of the controversie to be the surest, which now they load with unworthy mockings and reproaches: And if *They* were so, then were their Teachers so likewise, because it was for want of better companie that they changed no sooner.

*Secondly*,

Secondly, because a verie great proportion of the Churches Christian, heretofore and lately, hath in the main and leading parts of the controversie, gone that way which these now forsake, and would perswade the world to follow them. For the days of old let *Ger. Vossius* speak, never suspected for a partiarie while he wrote his Historie, unless it were for their side. After all his search, the brief of all he gives in is this. *De Histor. Lat. in Cassiano: Celeberrimi quique occidentalis Ecclesie Doctores, sequebantur Augustinum & Prosperum; Nec enim iudicio meo B. Augustinus prioribus Patribus repugnat, sed quod de Prædestinatione priores ferè Patres præteribant, hoc addit: Atque ubi illi de Gratia incautiùs essent locuti, hoc explicat:* that is, The most famous and most renowned Doctours that were in the Western Churches, followed *Augustine* and *Prosper*; neither in my judgement was *S. Augustine* contrarie to those Fathers that went before him; but that which they omitted about Predestination, he added; and that which they uttered somewhat negligently and unwarily, he explained. It is true that *Poelenburgh* in consutation of *Hornbecks* eighth chapter *Sum. Controv.* produceth *Vossius* to the contrarie, *lib 6. Th. 8.* testifying that all the Greek and Latine Fathers before *Augustine*, held that those were predestinate who God foresaw would live well:] but he left out what follows because it made clearly against him: *Verum intellexere præscientiam eorum quæ homo esset facturus ex viribus Gratia,*



*tia, tum praevenientis tum subsequentis, eoque antiquitatis ille consensus, nihil vel Pelagianos vel Semipelagianos juvat:* ] They understood the foreknowledge of what they would do by the strength of Grace : their consent therefore nothing avails either *Pelagians* or *Semipelagians*. For late ages, Popish Schoolmen are generally for the upper way ; it is *communis sententia* against *Massa corrupta* as the object, so witnesseth *Estius in Epist. p. 112*. Yea, the *Remonstrants* who were not of that opinion, do testify, *Apol. p. 63*. There is no doubt to be made but the Popish Doctours, and most of the Schoolmen, were Patrons of that opinion. For which their opinion *Calvin* wrote against them in divers places. I name these, *Instit. 3. 23. §. 2. Neque tamen commentum ingerimus absoluta potentia, quod sicuti profanum est, ita merito detestabile nobis esse debet. In Isai. c. 23. v. 9. Commentum illud de absoluta potentia Dei quod Scholastici invexerunt, execranda blasphemia est. Opusc. p. 1006. Commentum de absoluta Dei potentia detestabile est, quia ab aeterna Dei sapientia & justitia separari non debeat potestas*. I shall thank you therefore if you can help me to understand the meaning of *Hist. Qu. part. 1. pag. 38*. where the doctrine of the *Supralapsarians* is said to be first broach'd by *Calvin*. Surely those Papists could not follow him in that for which he reprehended them who were long before him. And the Council of *Trent* goes no further than to forbid men to presume themselves to be of the number of  
the

the predestinate, not denying the Decree, but onely affirming it to be secret and hidden, unless by special Revelation. In Popish countreys *ea opinio maxime viget*, saith the Preface to *Castellio's* pieces. And if these opinions be so odious and pernicious, what think you might be the reason why the Pope could be brought no sooner to declare against them? And if a great partie of *Papists* do still hold them, it is a great probability they are true, because it concerns their advantage and worldly gain, that they should not be true: For what freedom of Grace doth gain, that merit of works doth loose, and merit it is that bringeth in their profit.

The learned *D<sup>r</sup>. F.* by his Publisher was entituled, *The Divine*, with these two restrictions, of his Rank, and of his Age: I may add a third, of his partie, and then his testimonie is without exception, *pag. 3712.* *If as good a scholar as Bellarmine would take the pains to examine his opinion, as strictly as he hath done Calvins (touching reprobation) it would quickly appear to be for qualitie the very same, if not worse.*] And the Church of *England* teacheth the Doctrine of Predestination, yet knew it to be *A dangerous down-fall to carnal minds*, *Artic. 17.*

I am not speaking now of the Truth, or of the certaintie of these matters; nor at this time perswading any man to be of this judgement touching these opinions, whether they be certain or no, or whether they be true or no; this is certain, they are probable to be true: and that may be enough to per-

perswade men not to reproach them, though they beleeve them not. *Prudentibus* (saith *Sidonius*) *condictus insitum est vitare fortuita*: Wisemen use to be deeply rooted in this principle, not to run a great hazzard or capital adventure upon any thing that is dubious and uncertain. Good men out of a principle of conscience toward God, will not engage against their Sovereign Prince: and bad men, if they be not too bad and forsaken of God, dare not partake with them that are given to change; because of the wrath of man, foreseen as possible, though against common expectation; and because of that which *viciissitude*, or *παλιπρος ποταμός*, the turn of a present state and and posture may bring upon them.

The opinions furthermore (which your Reader must be directed, where he shall finde them made so odious) besides the Authority of a most considerable part of Christians, receive some probability from Gods dealing in this present world: his ways being not like ours, nor his thoughts like our thoughts: therefore are his works rightly counted wonderfull. Was there ever found any man who was well satisfied and contented with what God hath done and doeth upon earth, unless it were by laying to heart that it was his doing? I speak not now of *Cato* or *Socrates*, but of *David*, *Solomon*, and *Jeremy*. How many things come to pass contrary to mans wisdom? yea, which is more to our present purpose, contrary to mans goodness, that is to say, the goodness that is in man, and the good-

ness that ought to be in man? And if there be so much left in this world to our admiration; it is possible, yea it is likely there is much more in the other. *Hic est fidei summus gradus,* (saith Luther, *de servo arbitrio*) *credere illum esse clementem, qui tam paucos salvat, tam multos damnat*: This is the highest degree of faith, to beleieve that God is mercifull who yet condemneth so many, and saveth so few. And if we give allowance to our reason to come up so far as to keep even pace with our faith, we may perhaps a little satisfie our reason, and a while gratifie our affections, and likewise retain some kinde of religion. But let us remember that the Christian Religion hath always been accounted by the best Christians, to be as well against our will, as above our understanding.

In case of vile and scandalous words against some great Prince or Potentate, it hath been sometimes the manner for the Judges, not to hear the words publicly uttered or rehearsed; but as it were privately and apart to read and consider them: Even then and there where such words were to be aggravated to the height, and deeply censured. It were to be wished that the *Remonstrants*, and all that joyn with them, were half so moral and respectfull toward the God of heaven. For they seem to take delight to heap up terms most horrid, odious, and detestable, and charge them upon their adversaries how? as spoken by them? nor disclaimed by them, but following upon their opinions by consequences framed

framed or forged rather by their own selves. But if you and yours will not be otherwise minded than you are, nor take heed to your way, lest you offend with your tongue, in reproaching the living God; but that you will take pleasure to sharpen and poison the arrows of your reproaches with taunts and mockings, whereby to render Christianitie hatefull to the common people, who for the most part do so far contemn Gods manifest judgements of this life, that they are little busied with his secret decrees touching the world to come, saving that you would fain fill their heads with your venomous slanders: Then I will give this counsel to all Christians whomsoever, who think not much to take good counsel from whomsoever, that they beware how they give a willing ear to such offensive and distastfull speeches: and that they take heed of being conversant, and especially in taking pleasure and disport in such scurrilous writings, as *The Thief Predicinate*, and *Tilenus Examine*, with the like, lest they be given over to hardness of heart and a reprobate minde, as a just recompence of the delight they take in such wickedness. Religion is the most sacred and the most serious thing in the world: All serious persons think it so; and all idle ones will finde it so, when they shall come sooner or later to abominate and hold accursed that froth and some of wit, that presumeth profanely and sacrilegiously to make any article of Faith, any part of Christian profession, or the holy Scripture, the subject or matter of mirth and mockery.

In stead of asking pardon (for what I have now said, I will crave leave upon the same occasion to say a little more, before I pass from your fourth chapter.

To render *opinions* odious, although it may be bad enough, is yet pertinent. But it hath been always accounted moral, to spare the *persons*. Now that you may see how little heed is to be given to your Authours designe, while he would make his Adversaries *opinions* to be odious, I will here, being so fairly invited by you, give an instance of his haste and mistake while he endeavoured to make their *persons* odious. One instance, but a pregnant one, containing no less than four mistakes of his in less than twice so many lines. So I direct you to his 120 page of *Heautontimorumenos*, where thus he asperseth several persons: and first M. B. *as not able to write true English*, and who would not loath to read such an one. [“*He prays perfect non-sense, --he is skipping for joy out of sense and syntax, --his faults being greater than those of Rivet, of which the grave and wise Grotius took publick notice. And in this I have followed that great example*”] To this latter part is affixed in the margin out of Grotius’s *Votum pro pace*, which he wrote against Rivets *Examen*, [pag. 63. *Moneo nè qui Latine non didicit, Latine scribat*] with addition of some particulars or instances of false Latine, which there may be seen.

The perfect non-sense spoken of, was not written

ten by M. B. but was made by your Authour, taking one mood for another; the sentence is this being contracted [ *Now that God would be pleased to make up all our differences* ] If you take it in the *Subjunctive* mood, it is lame and imperfect: but take it in the *Optative*, as doubtless it was intended, and it is beyond all cavil and exception. The want of sense and Syntax was the Printers fault, a verie common one, in misplacing the latter semicircle of a *Parenthesis*, which being set where it ought, and as it might easily be, by any intelligent Reader, doth set all right: concerning which also M. B. in the verie next page did thus give warning, and did thus preface before the collection of the *Errata*, [ *As to the neglecting signes of Interrogation and Admirati-on, and such like small matters, they may be left alone for some jocular Adversary to make his games of.* ] So much for M. B. Now follows next the justification of the practise by the example of *Hugo Grotius*, who without any disparagement to his gravitie and wisdom, did finde out, and did publish to the world, some Grammatical oversights (as) in the writings of *Andrew Rivet*, with whom he was engaged in controversy. But what if it doth now appear, that *Grotius* did civilly conceal the true name of the partie that was thus peccant against the rules of Grammar, and your Authour did set down a false one? will you not grant that he hath wronged *Grotius* as well as *Rivet*, and hath taken a course to render both of them odious or despicable? Had

M. P. ever read the works of that learned and judicious man, or but taken notice that he was Divinitie-Professour in the Universitie of *Leyden*; and that he was made choice of, and singled out to be Tutour to the *Prince of Orange*, two employments undertaken usually by the most eminent and accomplished men that in the whole nation respectively are to be found: He would never have been so precipitate as to fasten upon *Rivet* the sorrie badge of a *John Lack-Latine*, upon the single testimony of a provoked Adversarie, and that without examining, not whether he said true, but whether he said so or no. But it is an ordinary thing for some men, without chewing to swallow the words of those, whose persons they have in admiration: and on the other side, upon slight or no grounds to entertain contemptible thoughts of their persons whose cause they disaffected. It is certain, 1, That *Rivet* never wrote what is there mentioned: and 2, That *Grotius* never charged him with it. And for proof of what I say, a verie perfunctory inspection may suffice: for the words quoted are brought in towards the end of a long digression, written also in a smaller character, containing a relation of some acts and historical passages at *Oxford*, *Reterdam*, and the *Hague*; but not one word of *Rivet*, or any thing concerning him: who therefore complaineth in the 66 Section of his Answer, called his *Apologetick*, of so large an excursion, and so extraneous: *Per sexdecim paginas excurret D. Grotius in alia, ea excutienda relinquam*



*is quorum interest:* that is, I leave the matters contained in so many pages to those that are concerned in them. As for the person understood and concealed, although I think he may be better known by some other tokens there specified, than by [ *Latine non didicit;* ] yet my chief aim being now to demonstrate who it was *not*, it is reason I should be so courteous to him, in suppressing his name, as *Grotius* was, who yet had received at his hands no small cause of distast: *And in this I have followed that great example.* But he who thought it not impertinent to render odious a person of so great note, of such merit and praise in the Churches, upon no other ground that I know, but because he was not of his own opinion, in those things wherein libertie of dissent was wont to be pleaded for and pressed; must not think me curious or over-busie, while I have done what I can to wipe off so unworthy a blur from the names of the illustrious *Hugo Grotius* and Doctour *Rivet*.



## CHAP. V.

*The prepared Sacrifice.*

*Seet. 1, 2, 3.* “ I Said not he offered up  
 “ himself in heaven, but  
 “ in his ascending into heaven. Strictly, the  
 D 4 offering

“ offering of the sacrifice was either the act  
 “ of the man bringing it to the Priest, be-  
 “ fore the slaying of it, or the act of the  
 “ Priest and that after it was slain, causing  
 “ the favour of it to go up by fire toward  
 “ heaven,

“ His yeelding up himself to obey and  
 “ suffer, yea humbling himself and obeying  
 “ to the death, though acts of sacrificing,  
 “ and of the sacrifice offering it self to be  
 “ sacrificed, were but preparatorie to his  
 “ Priestly oblation, strictly so called, in  
 “ in which the virtues of his bloud went up  
 “ to God, and was in the eternal Spirit, the  
 “ altar and fiery love of it, carryed up into  
 “ heaven a spotless Sacrifice.]

Strictly, the offering of the sacrifice was that which you have omitted, namely, the killing of it in relation to God. That which you call the oblation of the sacrifice, was a thing consequent upon the oblation; or at most, the compleating of the oblation, that is, the burning of part of it, and the ascending of the fire and smoke. For this is the nature of sacrificing, which I shall now tell you. The Priest is the officer or Mediatour betwixt God and Man: Man offereth his gift to God, when he wholly resigneth up his gift to him: this is done partly and preparatively by himself in the presentation: principally and fully by the Priest in the ma-

*station*

Station or slaying of it. The Priest killing the Sacrifice at the foot of the altar, doth then mans part, in offering to God mans gift. Now hath man done offering. In the next place God doth by his Priest dispose of the gift being thus made his: How? his altar devoureth one part, the Priest and the people the other. If therefore you would rightly know the true nature of sacrifices among the Jews, you must consider them not onely as exercises of obedience and divine worship in the general; or as acknowledgements that death was the stipend of sin; or as shadows and types that Christ should die for the sins of the world; though all these they were: But further they are to be considered as Federal rites or signes of a Covenant, Friendship, or Agreement betwixt God and man: As always feasting or eating together was a Symbol of familiarity, amitie, and mutual consent. Psal. 41. *My familiar friend that did eat my bread:* and 1 Cor. 5. 11. by those words, *With such an one, we not to eat*, familiaritie is forbidden. 1 Cor. 10. *We are one body*, because we are partakers of one bread. Thus the Altar is called *Gods Table*, Ezek. 41. 22. and in the first of *Malachi*, The Table of the Lord is contemptible, and the sacrifices are called *Bread* there, they offered polluted *Bread* upon the altar, when they offered the blinde and the lame for sacrifice. Levit. 21. 6. The offerings of the Lord made by fire, and *the Bread of their God* they do offer, *Bread*, it is well known in phrase of Scripture, signi-

signifieth all that is eaten, Malach. 1. 12. *His meat is contemptible.* Levit. 3. 16. The Priest shall burn them upon the altar, it is the *Food of the offering* made by fire. God is brought in, in figure and allusion or analogically, as eating what is burnt upon the altar. *Calvins* words upon the place last named are these; *Notatur familiaris Dei cum populo sua communicatio, ac si communem cum illis haberet mensam-- se cultoribus suis convivam facere dignatus est* that is, When the part of the sacrifice which was burnt upon the altar, is said to be Gods Meat or Food, it noteth, that God is pleased familiarly to converse with his people, and as it were, to feast together on the same feast with them. And to the same purpose *Grotius Annot. in Evag. p. 451.* *Quasi scilicet amicorum more communes cum ipsis epulas sumeret.* As humane passions are in a borrowed manner ascribed to God, after the same manner was eating in the burning of the sacrifices in the time of the Old Testament. In the fiftieth Psalm when it is said, *Thinkest thou that I will eat Bulls flesh?* though it be denied of God in a gross and carnal manner, and as if he needed it or did it out of hunger, yet is it even there intimated as true in a figurative signification. And it would never have been denied, had there been no colour for it, no likeness of it, had there been no likeness of it, more or less. The altar, and the fire of the altar do take Gods portion; the rest the Priest and people eat. 1 Cor. 9. 13. They which wait on the altar, are *Partakers*

makers of the altar. The altar taketh part, and they  
 take part: as servants usually wait on their master,  
 make ready the meat, & serve him til he hath eaten,  
 and afterwards they eat: Thus did the Levites make  
 the dinner ready, the Priests attended upon the ta-  
 ble, that is Gods altar, where he is supposed as it  
 were to eat, and afterward they did take their share,  
 and feed upon the reversion, *Præemptos cibos*, as *Mi-*  
*micus Felix* calleth the meats that were left of the  
 heathen sacrifices. So that the act of offering was  
 first before the fire came to be kindled, although  
 the gift that was offered, did remain there readie to  
 be burned. They who rendred *Idolothya*, things  
 offered to idols, did not think that the offering con-  
 sisted in the burning; for then the ashes must be  
 eaten, there being nothing else left. Incense was  
 offered strictly when it was burnt: but strictly,  
 beasts were offered when they were slain, though  
 they might be said to be offered too, in some sort,  
 when they were consumed by fire. And the rea-  
 son which you seem to give out of the Texts in  
*Leviticus*, chap. 1. and 3. is as weak as water. It is  
 called a *Burnt-offering made by fire*: doth the offering  
 therefore consist in the burning? No: but that  
 which was before offered, is now burnt, and there-  
 fore the *Burnt-offering*, or the offering made by fire, or  
 the offering fired. And you know well enough that  
 other languages give not the least colour for this  
 your new conceit, whatsoever the *English* with  
 some that are ignorant may do. And if the *whole*  
*burnt-*

*Burnt-offering*, one kinde of sacrifice were called for as you say, *from ascension*, it doth not follow thence that the offering consisted in the *ascending*.

And whereas you make application of this your fanſie, that Christs Priestly oblation should ſtrictly be, when he went unto God, and was carried up to heaven, you do after your wonted manner, confound Christs *Oblation* with his *Ascension*: and his ſtate of *Humiliation*, with his ſtate of *Exaltation*. *Hebr.* 9. 25, 26. Nor yet that he ſhould offer himſelf often, for then muſt he often have ſuffered. Doth not the Apoſtle ſay plainly here to your underſtanding, that Jeſus did offer himſelf then when he ſuffered, and in his ſuffering? And although you ſay, “It is one thing to offer himſelf in heaven (which you mean not)” and another to offer himſelf in his *ascending* into heaven (which was your meaning) yet on your page 22. you declare your ſelf plainly for the *Socinians*, teaching that the purgation was made in heaven: ſo you contradict one falſhood with another. Your words are, “Yea, how did his ſacrifice “purge the heavenly things themſelves, but by his “entering in once into the heavens, as *Hebr.* 9. 23 “where alſo in v. 26. his offering himſelf is made “by the Apoſtle to answer to the high Priests entering once into the holy place?” In what ſenſe ſoever it was that the heavenly things were purged, or purified, or dedicated, it was by that which was done on earth, and not by that which was done in heaven. Neither doth the Apoſtle, v. 26. op-

the high Priests entrance into the holy place, Christs entrance into heaven; but the high Priests entrance into the holy place *with the blood of others*, to Christs entrance into heaven with his own blood, that is, the vertue and merit of his own blood, Still you deceive your self or your Reader, with the ambiguity of the word *offer*, as if there were no difference betwixt presenting himself, and offering sacrifice.

---

*Seēt. 4.* “ That the Altar was the  
 “ Cross, a great mistake, Matth. 23. *Which*  
 “ *is greater, the gift or the altar that sanctify-*  
 “ *eth the gift?* by which reason they make  
 “ the cross greater than Christ as sanctify-  
 “ ing him.]

When the Altar is said to be the Cross, the meaning is, that as sacrifices were offered or slain at the altar (not upon it, but) at the foot of the altar, as *Revel. 6. 9.* under the altar; so was *Jesus Christ* offered and slain upon the cross: neither is there any fear from the words of our Saviour, though the altar be called the cross; because as *Christ* was, in divers respects, The sacrifice which was offered, and the Priest that offered, and the altar that sanctified the sacrifice: so might the cross in another respect be called the altar, because there he died: for these two being mutually related, so  
 that

that where there is a sacrifice, there is an altar also whether we make the altar to be the cross, or the Divine nature, as you call it, the fierie love of it, whatsoever it be that beareth most proportion to other altars; still we shall finde there will be some dissimilitude betwixt this altar, and that upon which the sacrifices were wont to be burnt. And where you compare the *ascending of the smoke of the sacrifice, which God is said to smell as a sweet savour, with Christs ascending into heaven*; It is Christs *Passion* not his *Ascension*, in which God was well pleased, with the smoke of the burnt-offerings: Eph. 5. 2. *Christ loved and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.* He gave himself for us, when he was crucified, and that was his love shewed to us, when he laid down his life for us: And accordingly is our justification ascribed to his blood or death: 1 Joh. 1. 7. *The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.* Revel. 1. 5. *He hath washed us from our sins in his blood:* and chap. 9. *Thou hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood.* Contrary to your doctrine therefore I may boldly affirm That *Christs death upon the cross, was that which did answer, fulfill, effect and accomplish, both the killing of the beasts, and the burning of them alive.* The question with you is about this latter. Heb. 13. v. 11, 12. *The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the high Priest for sin are burnt without the camp: wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctifie the people with his own blood, suffe-*



without the gate.] Hence is proved invincibly, that the crucifying of *Jesus Christ* was typified and prefigured by the burning of the beast: and that he did perfect and compleat the sacrifice of him, as much as the sacrificing of the beast was finished and completed, then when it was burnt and consumed to ashes.

- 
- “ His note from *Hebr. 9. 26, 28.* That to  
 “ suffer, and offer, and die, are made the  
 “ very same thing, is a gross mistake: to of-  
 “ fer was active, to suffer was passive.]

These three were in that case the verie same thing, howbeit the words differ in their severall significations. If it were true which you now teach in this matter, That Christs oblation of himself consisted in his ascension into heaven; you might very well say, that his oblation and ascension are the very same thing; yet to offer is one thing, and to ascend is quite another. You have many a *nimium nihil*, just like this same in this chapter, which I passe by; but this I have noted, that our Reader may observe, how little heed is to be taken to you, when you call aloud, *A gross mistake*, or use any the like false and deceitfull out-crie. He is too much to blame, that observeth your custome, and will trust you. And thus much for this *Socinian* chapter.



## CHAP. VI.

*Head of the Church.*

**F**OR your first *Section* I direct the Reader to the *Review*: and for your second, where you would prove the Apostles to be not temporary, but of perpetual standing, because it is said, Ephes. 4. *That we all come, &c.* I answer, it is sufficient for verifying these words, that some of the officers, namely Pastours and Teachers, continue to the end of the world: And secondly, The writings of the Apostles do abide still; and the Gospel preached by them at first, is brought along to our times, and as our blessed Saviour saith, Joh. 15. 16. *Their fruit remaineth*: and yet it cannot well be said in common manner of speech, and you leave us to guess at your meaning, when you say, the Apostles are of perpetual standing.

*Sect. 4. pag. 33.* I did relate what was done in the time of *Henry VIII*, without any desire to harm you: as he that should rehearse the severities enjoined by the Law of *Moses*, Deut. 18. 20. cannot be therefore said to wish it were put in execution now: nor desire any harm to them that have foretold the day of Judgement to befall in several years now past,

King

“ Kings incensurableness smells of flatter-  
 “ rie : and pag. 34. It is good for Rulers to  
 “ beware of flatterers, who have the poy-  
 “ son of asps under their lips, and kill in-  
 “ sensible and unsuspected, and therefore  
 “ are a more dangerous kinde of enemie  
 “ than (though not so frightfull as) open  
 “ Rebels, as *Dalilah* did *Samson*, more hurt  
 “ then the *Philistines* without her could  
 “ have done him. By M. H. principles, *Sam-  
 “ uel* was too blame to refuse to turn again  
 “ with *Saul*, and to go to visit him, --- and  
 “ the Priests of the Lord in *Uzziah*’s time;  
 “ and S. *Ambrose* in *Theodosius* time, were  
 “ sawcy fellows, for dealing as they did with  
 “ their Sovereigns, not remembring that  
 “ they were their Fathers; yet I am nei-  
 “ ther for the Popes Bulls, nor the *Scotch*  
 “ Presbyterie.

To praise, and to flatter; to reprove, and to re-  
 buke; these do well or ill, have good or bad effect,  
 according as the party is disposed upon whom they  
 are bestowed. Rebuke a wise man and he will love  
 you; but if you reprove a scorner, he will hate you:  
 if you praise a good man more than there is cause,  
 that is, if you flatter him, he will studie to deserve  
 your good word, and will be (as it were) ashamed to  
 come short of your commendation: and it will in  
 effect amount to an admonition or reproof. It is a

very good caution to Princes and great persons, to take heed of flatterers, who do in all things seek to sooth and please them, from whom oftentimes they receive damage, and so they do sometimes from those that out of quite contrary carriage do contradict, and cross, and provoke them.

If it be granted that a flatterer is in some sort worse than a rustical reprover, yet he is not better than a reviler, the excess always having more of vertue in it, or at least inclining more to it, than the defect; and especially in our demeanour towards our Superiours. And if a flatterer be the worst of enemies that deal in words; yet is he not so ill as those that wrong in hostile attempts: and therefore you kept no *decorum*, when you made flatterers worse than open Rebels, yea though growing frightfull. And there is a larger difference between a flatterer, and a traytour. The example of *Dalilah* had done well enough, to prove that a secret traytour is worse than an open Rebel; but to your present purpose it no way appertains.

For this particular kinde of flattery, that consisteth in ascribing too much power, greatness, or prerogative to Princes, as it is true, so it is impertinent to say they may be flattered: for so may the people too, to the prejudice of them both. Out of doubt, it is ill done to ascribe to either of them more than belongs to them. But here is the right question, To whom the supreme power of Religion belongs, whether to the King, to take care  
what

what Faith it is the subjects make profession of ; or to the subjects to be of what profession they will. And I think it is not well done to call that flattery, when no more is ascribed to any one than is due to him by the law of nature: by the Law of God, and by the law of the land respectively.

Towards the censurableness of Kings ( which was wont to be accounted amongst *dangerous positions* ) you bring three instances ; *Saul*, *Uzziah*, and *Theodosius*. As for *Saul*, *Samuel* refused to turn again with him, and to joyn with him in sacrificing what was forbidden to be sacrificed : but he did not refuse to turn with him, when he was to shew him honour before the people, in attending on him while he worshipped God, And inasmuch as God himself reproved *Samuel*, for shewing more regard and tenderness to *Saul* than he ought to have done, being peremptorily rejected ; we may well imagine how *Samuel* stood affected to *Saul* : how respectfull and how stedfast he would have been to him, had the case been ordinary. And *Uzziah* was not put out of that place that did belong to him: The Priests said, You shall not come into *our* place in the Temple: they said not, You shall not keep your own. If a Minister should not suffer one of his Communicants to consecrate and distribute the bread and wine in the Lords Supper, but forbid him: this would not come near so much as to abstention, and therefore this example comes not near: he pursues. And lastly, as to *Theodosius* ; I answer, If

*Constantine* the Great be reckoned the first Christian Emperour; then *Theodosius* the elder is the first Christian Emperour that is found among the Penitents, or under Ecclesiastical discipline; and the last too, for the space of seven hundred years, till the time of *Henry* the fourth and *Heldebrand*, when Hell, that is, Satan broke loose. Next, it is questioned whether it was well done of these two great persons, what they did. As some highly commend, so others much mislike the Emperours submission, and the Bishops austerity, as drawing danger and disgrace upon the Ruler of the people, whose dignity God provided for, by making a law that forbade all such speeches as favoured of detraction and contempt of him. Thirdly, I regard not much what *S. Ambrose* did. Actions Heroical, and Actions Zelotical recorded in Scripture or Church-Historie, are not rashly to be imitated, or drawn into example. I attend rather to his words: *Apolog. Dac. cap. 10. Liberi sunt Reges à vinculis delictorum, neque enim ullis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti imperii potestate*: that is, The power of Empire dischargeth Kings from the bands or censures of their transgressions, neither are they obnoxious to the penalties of laws as others are. The Popish Casuists resolve, That whosoever is excommunicate must be *Subditus*, he must have a Superiour, some or other: therefore with them the Pope is free, because there is none on earth above him; whosoever censureth another judgeth him, and whosoever judgeth

udgeth another, is superiour to him: and there cannot be two supremes, and there must be one.



## CHAP. VII.

### *The Magistrates power in Religion.*

*Seēt. 1.* “**A**T that rate I might conclude that M. H. knows  
 “ not how, and in what sort Christ is  
 “ Head of the visible Church, because he  
 “ hath not told us ]

This was not my omission, bnt your very great negligence: I told you how, in that place pag, 27.  
*In regard of the Graces of edification derived from him, for the Offices, Ministerie, and Governments of his Church, and in regard of the common benefits and common gifts of a spiritual kinde. ]* So now I have told told you twice.

---

*Seēt. 2.* I Think they have a minde to  
 “ settle their Contra-Remonstrant or Pres-  
 “ byterian Principles by persecution. ]

If I should ask you why you make these two terms all one which yet look severall ways, one of  
 E 3 them

belonging to Doctrine, the other to Government, I know not what you would plead for your self, unless it be Custome, a custome that you have to confound, and unkindly to mix and make up together things heterogeneous and quite different. And because you seem to be better acquainted with the opinions of the *Remonstrants*, than you are with their persons, therefore let me tell you, First, that the *Remonstrants* were *Presbyterians*, and lived under that Government, and misliked it not. Onely in the doctrine of these Churches they excepted against four points; and doubted somewhat of the fifth. And in the year 1622, they put forth their Confession or Declaration of their opinions, in the chief heads of Religion, and in the 21 chapter their words are; *Cum Episcoporum & Presbyterorum omnium munus sit docere ac regere, manifestum esse satis videtur, aliis in alios imperium nullo jure divino competere.* To teach and to govern belongeth to Bishops and to all Presbyters, neither have they by divine right any power one over another.

Secondly, Those Divines who went out of great Britain, and were assistant in the National Synod, where these doctrinal differences were examined, were all of them Episcopal men, and three of them were Bishops either then or afterward, and when they were to give approbation to the *Belzick* confession, they kept themselves onely to points dogmatical, and would not examine those two articles, the thirtieth and the one and thirtieth, which concern-



ed Ecclesiastical order; as is inserted in the *Acts*,  
*Sess.* 144. and which is more than so, and which is  
not inserted, they did in the very next *Session* open-  
ly impeach the *Presbyterian* Government and Pari-  
tie of Ministers. So far were they from being, ac-  
cording to your medley, *Contra-Remonstrants* and  
*Presbyterians*, *Sed cursum mutavit iniquum frugibus*  
*amnis Doctus iter melius*. So you would have it at  
least, that now these terms should turn their wonted  
course, and carrie quite another meaning than they  
did heretofore. But because you are readie to take  
up any thing, though it be never so *nonsensical* ( to  
use your own word ) that you imagine any way to  
make for you, give me leave to tell you further,  
First, that there is no great heed to be taken to his  
complaint, who misliketh the *Presbyterians* for that  
which they are to be commended for, and for that in  
which the *Episcopal* part joyns with them: w<sup>ch</sup> is this,  
That they desire and endeavour that Religion may  
be nationally established, and some kinde of govern-  
ment and discipline Ecclesiastical settled. And se-  
condly, They who are not content to commend  
their form of Government as good, and as the best;  
but further set it forth as *Christs throne and spiritual*  
*kingdome*, are not matched, but outgone by them,  
who make it a point of Christian libertie, and a  
part of Christs kingdome, to have no Church-go-  
vernment at all. And as it is no good Logick, to  
oppose *Presbyterian* and *Remonstrant*; so it is no  
great honestie to make the world beleieve it, if

they could, that none but *Pre/byterians* oppose  
*Remonstrants*.

“ Himself alledges a passage where I  
“ commend Authority for securing Religi-  
“ on against Blasphemie by civil sanction;  
“ therefore he might see I am not the  
“ man he represents me. I put a great dif-  
“ ference betwixt Blasphemies and diffe-  
“ rences in opinion.

Some kinde of blasphemie I ever thought you  
were willing should be suppressed, though it be con-  
trary to your principles that it should. That which  
I noted out of you in the place alledged was this,  
That you who in one place do call the establish-  
ment of the *Contra-Remonstrant*, or seeming or-  
thodox opinion, a bloody sanction, in another place  
would have the Magistrate make provision against  
*them*, by enacting a law like that which was made  
against direct blasphemie: and how do you then  
put a difference betwixt Blasphemies and Differen-  
ces in opinion?

*Seet. 3.* “ To pleasure him a little with  
“ my thoughts about the Magistrates pow-  
“ er in matters of Religion, I shall say brief-  
“ ly; 1. He may not exercise the authority  
“ of

“ of the Dragon, spoken of Rev. 13. assume  
“ names of Blasphemy, set up and inforce  
“ images of any other Object, Authour, or  
“ *Medium* of worship, than God and Christ,  
“ and the mediums, ways, and ordinances of  
“ his appointment; nor back with his au-  
“ thority those that do, compelling men to  
“ worship them, swear to them, blaspheme  
“ Gods name, pollute Gods rest, &c. Nor  
“ may he oppress, abuse, persecute, and de-  
“ stroy his subjects, or suffer them to be per-  
“ secuted and destroyed, and especially up-  
“ on such accounts. 2. He is *Custos utri-*  
“ *usque tabula*, keeper of both tables, both  
“ as to his own practise and worship, as to  
“ the Authour, Object, Ultimate end, *me-*  
“ *dium*, and way of it; He is to receive and  
“ do nothing, but as Gods commands ap-  
“ prove, and so as to the manner of his wor-  
“ ship in spirit and truth; his use and obser-  
“ vation of Religious oaths, observation of  
“ Gods Sabbath or rest, carriage to his sub-  
“ jects, &c. And in respect of others; He  
“ hath power to see that Gods worship be  
“ preached and practised, purely and sin-  
“ cerely, without idolatrie, superstition, or  
“ humane inventions, mediums, and impo-  
“ sitions; false oaths, or sinfull; breach of  
“ Sabbath, or additions of rests, otherwise  
“ than Gods word alloweth may he not suf-  
fer;

“fer; nor his subjects to oppress, defraud,  
 “or harm one another, especially to oppress  
 “one anothers conscience; no, though they  
 “be Bishops; he may not suffer them to  
 “binde upon his people their inventions,  
 “and inflict penalties upon men, meerly  
 “for non-conformity to their wills, where  
 “they declare their consciences dis-satisfi-  
 “ed; but he may pull down all false objects,  
 “and mediums of worship, impositions of  
 “forms and ceremonies that offend and  
 “trouble tender consciences, or impositi-  
 “ons of opinions, with penalties in such  
 “things where persons may be of different  
 “apprehensions, and yet all fearers of God:  
 “he may see that the Apostles practises in  
 “not imposing in things indifferent; yea,  
 “decreeing against the practise of such  
 “things as all could not practise without  
 “offence, as *Acts* 15. 28, 29, 30. is to be  
 “observed. He may send forth his Prin-  
 “ces to teach the truth, as *Jehoshaphat* did  
 “with some Levites, yea and preach it him-  
 “self, if thereto fitted, &c.

You pleased me a little, but you pleased the  
*Sectaries* a great deal more, in carving thus, or  
 cramping rather the power of the Magistrate about  
 Religion to serve your own purpose, and your own  
 partie, as *Praxiteles* made the statue of *Venus Cri-*

dia by his own *Phryne*: or like your friend *Bellar- mine*, with the fifteen marks that he gave of the Catholick Church, which he thought might some way or other be fitted to his Romane Lady. While you were limning the several parcels of the Magistrate power, you took care to prevent all prejudice to your other opinions, whatsoever they were, or whatsoever they might be for the time to come, *in alea hominum*, as the fall of the Die may happen, and still as you went along, you were casting your eye upon that *Saint* which *Salmasius* speaks of and calleth *Divæ Independentiæ*, in the eleventh Chapter of his *Defence of the King*. And I observe this your Picture is almost all shadow, and dark, or negative. In your first *Paragraph*, and in the greater part of your second, you say not what the Magistrate may do, but what he may *not* do. So you lay a Restraint upon him, in stead of teaching what authoritie he hath. Of him that was the first founder of a sect of the *Academicks*, *Arcefilas* by name, *Lactantius* wrote thus, *De falsa Sap.* in the third book: *Constituit novam non philosophandi philosophiam*: He set up a new kinde of no kinde of Philosophie; and you have found out here a new kinde of no kinde of Church-government for the supreme Magistrate to busie himself about. He must not do this, nor he must not do that. His ruling must be to see that none rule in impositions of forms, or opinions; and that is, that every man may rule and do in religion what he will, what is good in his own eyes,

eyes, which is Hemlock that will grow of it self in such times especially, when there is no king in Israel.

“ *He is to receive and to do nothing, but as Gods commands approves* ] You speak confusedly, as you do also soon after, when you say, [ *Otherwise then Gods word alloweth he may not suffer* ] I am to tell you therefore, that Gods word alloweth many things that are not commanded nor appointed by him in his word. And this is sufficient to justify them, that there is nothing in Gods word against them, or forbidding them.

“ *Without Idolatrie, Superstition, or humane inventions* ] For the two first of these we are agreed; but for humane inventions I differ from you for your words carry with them a deniall of the Churches authority, in framing; and the Magistrate authority in confirming Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical. And this your doctrine concerning humane inventions and impositions, I take to be Superstition: the true nature of which consisteth in taking away the indifferency of things indifferent: whether it be in placing holiness and Gods worship, in the practise of such things as are not enjoined of God: Or in abstaining from such things as are displeasing to him, which he hath nowhere prohibited. He that forbiddeth in Gods service humane inventions, that are neither impious nor imposed as parts of Gods worship, maketh more negative precepts than God hath made. A

the Apostle saith of meats, 1 Cor. 8. *Neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse.* The like may we say of Vestures, and all things of an indifferent nature, whether we use them or use them not, we are neither the better nor the worse; and to say we are the better or the worse, is superstition.

But when you say, He hath power to see that Gods worship be preached and practised purely and sincerely, *without idolatrie, superstition, or humane inventions*, you add not a word touching *heresie* and *error in belief*: is not the word of God a rule *tam fidei quàm cultûs*? and is there not false doctrine, as well as false worship? It is true that [ *purely and sincerely* ] do comprehend very much; but your addition following I take as a diminution: you limit and restrain what you say to *idolatrie, superstition, and humane inventions*: yea, within a few lines you make it a part of his authoritie to pull down *impositions of opinions*. You leave us unsatisfied, neither do I think that you are able to give any good reason, why the Prince should set himself against *Idolatrie*, more then against *Heresie*. and why Christians may not have as much liberty in the practical worship of God, as they may have in their opinions and belief; there being a mutual and necessary connexion betwixt these two principal and integral parts of Religion. And even while you speak against tolerating idolatrie and superstition, your principles plead for them, even for all sorts of idolatries:

latries : For if men must cleave onely to what they understand, and walk in what they are satisfied in, there is no idolater that will readily understand you, or be satisfied with what you can say, so as to be brought off from his idols, and betake himself to the true God, and his true worship.

“ *False oaths or sinfull* ] The Magistrate may give an oath : if it be a false oath, it is his fault that takes it, not his that gives it. For never yet was any man put to swear that such a thing, or such an opinion is true: and therefore he could not be put upon it to swear that which is false. He that some years now past, wrote a Discourse of conforming in *Revolutions of Government*, pag. 54. complains of the dangerousness of those *Affertory oaths*, which require us to swear that such or such a thing or opinion is true, which may seem clearly so to the learned contrivers of those oaths, but not so to others.] What you mean by false oaths I know not : but I think this Authour aimed at the oath of *Supremacie* ; but he was very much mistaken in supposing that oath to be *affertory* of the Kings *Supremacie*: If that be it that is sworn, it is not a false oath, but it is a very vain one to swear that which the Court knows already, and is firmly perswaded of. An oath is an end of doubt and controversie. What is the doubt? It is not whether the King be *Supreme* or no : but whether the partie sworn beleevs it or no : So that it is a kinde of *Purgatory* oath, whereby the party clears himself from the suspicion of a *Papist*, by denying a chief point of *Poperie*. “ *Ad-*



“ *Additions of rests* ] You may charge them with *additions of rests*, who hold their festival days to be more holy than other days are: and equal to the Lords day or Christian Sabbath, and the observation of them to be a part of divine worship. Thus the *Papists* do: and thus the *Papists* say the *Protestants* do not: and you may safely be so courteous as to beleieve them. That cannot be said to be *added* to any thing, that is not of the same nature with it; as he that expoundeth the word of God, doth not *add* to the word, unless he maketh his exposition to be equal to the word, and of the same authoritie with it. The *Hebrews* by the ministry of *Moses* received of God their *Canon-Law*, touching Government of the Church, as well as they did their *Civil-Law* for Government of their State or Nation. And we will suppose that the Christian Church which is left more at libertie, is not now deprived of that authority and power, which the Church of God in the time of the old Testament had, in setting apart some days of rest, either annual or occasional; either of rejoycing or humiliation, as do witness their feast of *Purim*, and their feast of *Dedication*, and their Fasting-days, which were not of divine command, and are mentioned *Zechar. 7.5. & 8. 19.*

“ *Meerly for non-conformity to their wills* ] Those who through want of age, or of ought else, know nothing of Episcopal Government in *England*, more then you here tell them, you would make beleieve

leeve thus speaking, that it is merely arbitrary, no way limited or regulated. But you cannot be so ignorant as not to know thus much, that none are punished for non-conformity to the Bishops will. What penaltie any man suffereth, is for not observing the Laws of the land, and the Canons of the Church; which Laws and Canons are not made but by such persons as are assembled by vertue of the Kings Writ: nor are they taken notice of, unless they be approved by the Royal assent. Here therefore you either speak unadvisedly, or else against the Kings Authoritie in matters Ecclesiastical.

“ *Impositions of forms* ] If forms be lawfull (as I am sure they are) imposition cannot make them unlawfull. What you may do of your own libertie, you may do likewise when you are enjoined to do it; Unless (as some place holiness in observing mens precepts) you place holiness in breaking of them.

---

“ *He may see that the Apostles praëtises in*  
 “ *not imposing in things indifferent, yea, de-*  
 “ *creting against the praëtise of such as could*  
 “ *not praëtise without offence, as Acts 15.*  
 28, 29. be observed.

*First, The Apostles did impose in things indifferent. Eating meats offered to idols, was lawfull*

in it self, or indifferent, else *S. Paul* would not have taught and resolved the *Corinthians*, that they might buy them, and eat them without question, as Gods creatures with thanksgiving; provided that they did not eat them *formally* or *religiously*, with conscience of the idol: yet the Apostle by a decree commanded to abstain from them: but I pray observe well in what manner that was done: for that decree was (1) Temporary, lasting but for a time; and [2] Local, not Universal, or all the Christian world over, but concerning onely the Church of *Antioch*, and the Churches depending on it, where many of the *Jews* had their abode.

*Secondly*, Other things which they found indifferent, so they left them: though they did not decree the practise of them, they did not decree against the practise of them, as you say they did.

*Thirdly*, It is a very vain imagination of yours, that the Apostles had such regard to them that could not practise without offence, those things that were imposed; and that therefore they would impose onely things necessary. The particulars (excepted Abstinence from fornication) were necessary, how? not in themselves, but for the peace of the Church at that time. It was thought requisite to compose and settle some differences, and prevent some offences, by enjoying forbearance from some things for a while.

Those whom you call *Dissatisfied in Conscience*, and persons of different apprehensions, may be

F such

such as the Apostle calleth *Ignorant*. If any man be ignorant, that is, wilfully ignorant, when sufficient care hath been taken for his information, let him be ignorant; and such he calleth *contentious*: and if any man be contentious, the Custome, much more the Law of the Church is enough to silence him. And he saith further, *Mark them which cause divisions and offences*. Never would there be any order or constitution of a Church, but mere confusion, if nothing must be decreed to be practised that cannot without offence be practised, by those that are ready to cause divisions and offences.

- 
- “ *He may send forth his Princes to teach the*  
 “ *truth, as Jehoshaphat did with some Levites*  
 “ *yea, and preach it himself, as David and*  
 “ *Solomon did, if thereto fitted, &c.*

You have drawn a kinde of vail over three several places or parts of this your picture; the vail of  
 &c. I will not attempt any where to strike it, lest I have  
 served as *Zeuxis* was in *Pliny*, when he hastened upon  
 the stage, to look what it was that might be underneath  
 the curtain that his Antagonist had painted.  
 Yet would I gladly know whether within this last  
 any such thing as *CALLING* be couched or no; for  
 my part I think it is contained under *Fitness*, when  
 that no man is *fitted* to officiate in publick that is  
 not *called*; and that there is Ecclesiastical Idoneity

as well as Moral; and the one requisite in a preacher, as well as the other. But if I guess aright by your words, you are not of that minde, but think (with some others that walk disorderly) that Abilities, Competencie of knowledge, Boldness, Volubilitie of language, and what else there is of that kinde, without an outward Call, do sufficiently furnish any man to be a publick preacher. But the examples you bring are no proofs. *Jehoshaphat* sent out preachers *ad docendum*, that the people might be taught; and with them he sent Priests and Levites, who taught the people, 2 *Chron.* 17.9. The Princes did and spake what was proper to them; and the Priests and Levites likewise did their part, and theirs was to Teach: *Deut.* 33.10. *They, the tribe of Levi, shall teach Jacob thy judgements, and Israel thy law.* And as the case was at that time, when the people were to be reclaimed, and brought back to the God of their fathers; had the Priests and Levites gone forth alone, without civil Authoritie, directive, coercive, and coactive, they might probably have been mocked and contemned, as the messengers were that *Hezekiah* sent to give warning of keeping the Pass-over.

“*Yea, preach it himself as David and Solomon did.*” *David* and *Solomon* were Kings, but without they were Prophets, extraordinarily inspired, men-men of holy Scripture: and may all Kings be teachers because *Solomon* was so? If you have done the supreme Christian Magistrate any injurie,

in what you have now written; here, if it be compensation, you make it in giving him more than is his own, or than of right belongeth to him. Artic. the 37 of the Church of England, *We give not our Princes the ministring of Gods word.* To which Article rather than you will conform, you choose to give countenance to the slanders of the *Papists*, and so far as you can, to make them good. *Calvinistis in Anglia mulier quædam est summus Pontifex:* so said *Bellarmino* during the *Queens* reign: and we are quit with them now for the story of the woman-Pope which they tell us of, so cried *Sancta Clara*. And to that purpose you seem to close with the *Anabaptists*, teaching that gifts do fit for ministerial duties, without any other door of entrance; extending this libertie particularly and expresly to Kings and Princes. The leaven of which doctrine (if it be encouraged) may attempt Magistracie as well as Ministerie, that every one may take upon him the office of ruling and judging that is thereto fitted.

When *John the Baptist* refused to baptize our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who was without all comparison more excellent than himself; our Saviour willed him to forbear, and not to insist upon the worthiness or unworthiness of their persons, but to do at that time what was decent and behovefull to be done, and to fulfill all righteousness, namely, in good order, and of that vocation which each of them had taken upon him to perform, answering his reason to this effect, as if he had said; When

the more worthy is to be baptized, then he that is less worthy, if he be called to it, and in place for it, may and ought to baptize him; this is right and just, decent and orderly. It may so fall out, that an auditour or person of private capacitie, is of so good endowments, industrie, and learning, as that his Teacher publicly authorized, may well be taught many things by him, even such things as belong to his own profession, and may say, I have need to be taught by you: yet the private person must not usurp the publick place, because he is the more able, and the better fitted of the two. Remember the Apostles rule, *Let all things be done decently and in order.*



## CHAP. VIII.

*The Law.*

*Sect. 2.* “**VV** As there ever such a Non-sensicall thing  
 “ found? he faults those answers, as deny-  
 “ ing that which he proves out of them.”]

You are not the first that hath spoken contradictions, nor shall I be the last that confuteth an Adversarie out of his own words. You assigned five uses of the Law. To be a *Rule of life*, was none of

The five: yet I proved it to be a rule, by consequence from your first use, *To shew us what is sin.* You taught it not *directly*: and everie one could not gather so much from your words. But they who held the Law to be neither ruling nor binding might nevertheless continue in that minde still. But I have gained thus much, and likewise so many others, that you have spoken out and confessed the truth, and I am glad to hear it. I pray you keep your self to it for the time to come.

---

*Seet. 3.* I know no reason for your loud challenge of wrong and dishonestie: you faulted Ministers for being Teachers of the Law, to such as were not well principled for duties. If there be some men so unqualified, that we must not preach the law to them, then it is no rule to the unconverted, which was all I said, and I might well say it from you. According to your Divinitie, so far as I can perceive, the principles are not many. There is one To beleeve that God loves us: and he that beleeves this, is in a manner converted. But as I think, we may talk of duties to those that have not principles, not *any* principle to perform them, that they may know what need they have of a principle which might enable them to perform them: and that in the mean time, they may do *ea quae sunt Legis*, what the Law commandeth for the substance of it, though not as they ought for the manner,



In your *Seet. 4.* I shall not need to take notice of any thing, saving how you justify your answer to your Question 290.

“ If I say in making Latine, according to  
 “ *Tullyes* or *Quintilians* style, asman observes  
 “ all the rules of Grammar and Rhetorick,  
 “ is it all one as to say, that gives a *super-*  
 “ *sedes* to all Grammar and Rhetorick,  
 “ and teaches them to have no use or need  
 “ of them ? Who ever had to deal with an  
 “ unhappier Reviser ?

But, first, when you asked the childe the question, *Oughtest thou not to walk in the observation of the ten Commandments ?* why did you not teach him to answer plainly and positively, Yes ? whereas the Answer that you framed for him, amounts to a Negative: *In acting forth Faith and Love I do observe also those Commandments* ] which is as much as if you had told him, that he shall not need to observe the ten Commandments, otherwise than by acting forth Faith and Love.

And secondly, for your similitude from Grammar-learning, I answer, He that hath attained *Tullyes* or *Quintilians* style, may well lay aside and neglect all Grammar-rules, and rules of Rhetorick, and needeth them no more than an ordinary country-man, that hath by custome learned to speak true English, doth stand in need of an English Grammar, which he never yet looked into, it may

be never heard of. As he that can swim well, throws away his bladders, and the lame man that hath recovered his legs at the Bath, leaves his crutches there that helped him thither. And will you say, or dare any man say, that he who hath attained the highest degree of Faith and Love that is attained in this world, may neglect, forget, or not give heed to the ten Commandments? Where is our obedience to Gods Law, if our eye be not upon his Law? or what is obedience, but as it is in *Psal. 119. 6. To have respect to all Gods Commandments?* So you have mended the matter well with your similitude; you teach children, even children at their first, to observe the ten Commandments as *Cicero* observes the rules of Rhetorick, who was himself a rule to Rhetorick.

---

The fifth *Section* is full of heavy complaints and charges. I shewed how you, as well as some others did mistake the Apostles words of, *The Law becometh a Schoolmaster to Christ*, because he speaketh not comparatively of a beleever with an unbeliever, but of the state of the Gospel with the state of the Old Testament. Here you say, “*That I have merely slandered you, and you have been for many years of my minde for all these things.*”

*Answ. 1.* It being an ordinary mistake of others who recede from the *Antinomians* more then you do, I had no reason to leave you out.

2. If you were indeed of that minde then, and so had been for many years, you did not hold so long; for after not many leavs turned over, I finde you of another minde, pag.83. [*The Apostles did not bring men under servitude, as Moses formerly, but to Sonship.*] You make an opposition betwixt *Servitude* and *Sonship*; whereas it should be betwixt manhood and minoritie of age, or the like; if you had continued in that minde you were of. Our Reader must now do his part to judge who is wronged, and how far. And as for the satisfaction you would have of me: it is in your power to clear and set right with others your own reputation. And so long as you charge your pretended Orthodox, with seeking Gods promises by the works of the Law, and with establishing their own righteousness; and while you say, that Teachers of the Law, do they know not what; you will be thought to be an *Antinomian*, whether you be one or no.

---

“ He adds some pretty stories of what  
 “ manner of Schoolmasters some had.]

That proverbial form, *Vclut Epicitharisma post fabulam*, *Rhenanus* explaineth by the custome of the preachers in his time, which was after some deep discourse of dark points in Divinitie, to tell some fine and pleasant storie of some Saint. or other out of the legend, to keep the people from falling asleep.

sleep. If the Reader thought so well of my stories, as you do, they might somewhat serve to refresh him, being possibly (though it were but early) grown dull and heavie with reading. But I rather think that you grew dull betimes; for the instances that I alledged, were not to shew what school-masters some had; but to shew that a *Pedagogue*, which is *S. Pauls* word, doth not signifie a *school-master* in the vulgar notion, though perhaps it must be rendred so; but one that waited on great mens sons, to teach them how to behave themselves, and to frame their manners agreeable to their state.

I omit your explications, and come to the close of this chapter.

---

“ I said, The Law with other Scriptures  
 “ is of use to instruct, reprove, &c. which is  
 “ all one in sense with the rule of obedience.  
 “ Onely I contented my self with  
 “ the Scripture-phrase, and used not that  
 “ of the Churches.

Something it was then, I was sure, that you would not let fall such a word, that the Law should be a *Rule*, or that it should *Einde*. When you would not speak as the Church speaketh, well might I think you did not mean as the Church meaneth. The Apostle *Paul*, who biddeth us *be of one minde*.

2 Cor. 13. 11. beseecheth us also that *we speak all the same thing*. And when he would have us to glorify God, *Unanimes, uno ore*, Rom. 15. 6. with one minde and one mouth; can you imagine but that he would have us to instruct and teach the people with one minde, and one mouth? This humour of yours is a bad symptom, and as it may be hurtfull to the Church of God, so most certainly it is scandalous. They that know the old guise of hereticks, will think never the better of you for keeping your self so close to the *Scripture-phrase*, but have reason to think the worse. *Arius* being required by the Emperour to deliver a confession of his Faith, gave it so, that he observed the bare words of Scripture, *γεννην ἑνὴν καὶ ἀπὸ ἑ*, *Sozom.* 2. 28. They suspected him the more for this, and found him the more fraudulent. Concluding therefore this matter, I tell you, that by your delivering your self in such a manner, you have caused the offence that is given, contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, *Rom.* 16. 17. Neither is it much material, whether your opinion were such as I charged you withall, or not; so being that it were vehemently probable by your words that such your opinion was.

CHAP.



## CHAP. IX.

*Professours to break bread.*

**I**N your ninth chapter, which concerneth Laymens administring the Eucharist, you put me to a double task: first, I must prove it is your opinion, because you seem to denie it: and secondly, I must prove the same your opinion to be false, because you seem to maintain it.

---

“ That Christ in the instituting of it appointed or designed Ministers onely to do it, or makes any mention of them, I finde not.]

To what purpose is this said, but to shew that others not ordained may give the Eucharist? But you can finde that every man must abide in his calling; and that none must walk disorderly, nor invade anothers place or work. But what think you of the constant practise of the Church? Hath not Custom, if there be no more, the force of a second law, as well as of a second nature? But you finde our Saviour limiting the Sacrament, as well as the word, saying, *Go teach all nations baptizing them.*

But

But you finde the ministration of the word limited to certain persons: *How shall they preach unless they be sent? No man taketh this honour to himself. Paul and Barnabas must be separated to the work.* If preaching the word be proper to persons set apart, then administration of the Sacraments also: The reason is, because the Sacraments are but the word or Gospel made visible, and do contain, after their manner, what is in the word, and somewhat more; namely, a plainer representation to our senses, a nearer application, and a mutual stipulation and agreement: The word may be preached to infidels, and propounded to them by way of parley: The Sacraments contain the solemn confirmation of the agreement between the parties. It is the *Sealing* of a Will, Writing, or Covenant, that is the most authentick and formal act for making up the instrument. My argument then is this: The Eucharist containeth in a Sacramental manner, that which is in the word, and somewhat more too. If a person ordained, and none else must administer the word, then he and none else is to administer the Eucharist.

Our brethren of the Congregational way, as they do communicate with others in the word and prayer, but not in the Sacraments, whence they are termed *Semi-separatists*; so in their declaration of their faith and order, although they allow others besides Pastours and Teachers to preach the word publickly and constantly, pag. 58. §. 13. yet they say,

say, *The Lord Jesus hath appointed his Ministers to bless, and set apart, and give the bread and wine in the Lords Supper*, pag. 94. §. 3. And while you differ from them in this and divers other points of moment, you cannot take your place, which otherwise you might, among the *Congregationalcs Orthodox*, in the scheme that *George Horn*, who calleth himself *Honorius Reggius* hath drawn, to hold all the Sects of Great Britain.

---

“ He should have done better to have  
 “ shewed in what chapter and verse Christ  
 “ or his Apostles said, Let none but ordained  
 “ Ministers administer the Sacraments, than  
 “ to have told us what a curse the Council  
 “ of *Trent*, a Popish Antichristian Council,  
 “ ordained against others, besides to whom  
 “ they allow ministring of them : but of  
 “ that not a word.]

But you know I named not that Council, as intending to ascribe any value or authoritie to it, but onely to shew how the Protestants disclaimed the opinion. Divers errours are there anathematized, which the Protestants never held ; but by so doing the world was invited to beleeve, that such errours they held. I named *Calvin* then, who saith in his *Antidote*, that no man in his right senses doth think so : and now I name *Chemnitius* in his *Examen* : who



who misliking the opinion, proves also that *Luther* never held it, but opposed it while he opposed the Anabaptists. And Dr. *Whitaker* in Defence of his Answer to *Campians ten Reasons*, lib. 8. *Quis nescit, neque Laicis, neque Diaconis concedi, ut Eucharistiam conficiant?* Who knows not this, that neither Laymen nor Deacons may consecrate the Eucharist? I return you answer therefore: You should have done better to have taken notice why I alledged the Council of *Trent*, namely, to shew how the Protestants universally neglected the curse there framed, and detested the error there condemned; than to tell us it was a Popish Antichristian Council: but of that not a word.

---

“ The Church of *England* in her Catechisme doth not mention the Minister in treating of the Sacraments.

But the 23 Article maketh provision, *That none shall administer the Sacraments before he be lawfully called.*

“ *Nor Ursin* ] In the definition of a Sacrament he doth not: but under the fourth head, What the agreement is, and what the difference betwixt the Word and the Sacraments, the fourth particular of the agreement is in these words, *Utraque Deus exequitur per Ministros Ecclesie*: God doth deal both Word and Sacraments by the Ministers of the Church.

“ Whether

- “ Whether those men that *Peter* com-  
 “ manded to baptize *Cornelius* and his  
 “ household, were ordained or not, no bodie  
 “ can tell.]

Some will tell you that *Peter* himself baptized them; neither is it said that *Peter* commanded any to baptize them, but *jussit baptizari*, he commanded them to be partakers of that Sacrament: or if he commanded any man to baptize them, you cannot tell but he to whom he gave that charge was ordained: and have far more reason to think he was, than to think he was not.

I think you may remember who it was that once brought an argument to your present purpose, in behalf of persons unordained, from the name *Eucharist*, which signifyeth, *Giving of thanks*. [What fault is it if some of Gods people administer a Thanksgiving?] and I do remember that a certain Authour, that wrote against mixt Communion, brought twenty arguments to prove the Lords Supper not to be a converting Ordinance; and fetched one of them, namely the eleventh from the name *Eucharist*: *The Eucharist*, saith he, *is an Ordinance of Thanksgiving, and Consolation, but unconverted persons are not to be called to thanks and joy, but weeping and mourning.*] So that from the word *Eucharist*, which yet is not directly found in Scripture, but assumed by the Church, to note, The Lords Supper; while one maintaineth, that He

who

who is not a converted Christian may not be partaker of it; another would maintain, that He who is not a professed Christian, and no more, may be the minister of it. Both which opinions are as unwarrantable, as the reason taken from the Name is weak and groundless. For in words and names, we must not regard what their original is, and their etymologie, or whence they came; but what they are brought to by use and custome: if Eucharist doth signifie Thanksgiving in the Greek; yet in the Church of God, it is appropriate to the Lords Supper in common acception. But secondly, take the word in that sense, whence it is taken to denote the Lords Supper, and it doth not signifie *Thanksgiving*, but *Benediction* or *Blessing*, and, as may easily appear by conferring the Evangelists, To give thanks is to bless: as when many sit down to meat at table, we will suppose that all of them give thanks *morally*; yet *formally*, one doth give thanks; which is the same, *blesseth* the table. and when *Iustin Martyr Apolog.* pag. 76. maketh mention of *εὐχαριστία*, speaking of the Lords Supper, it is plain that he took *Eucharist* for Consecration, or sacerdotal benediction, and not for giving of thanks. From the consecrating of the bread and wine, or blessing of them, which is but one act, the whole service is called the *Eucharist*. So that this word being rightly understood, affordeth a solid argument against lay-mens administering the Lords Supper. For to whom doth it belong to bless, but

to the Priests and the Ministers, under both the old and new Testament? *Deut.* 10.8. to this office he separated the Tribe of *Levi*: to bless persons and things, and in this also consisted chiefly the priesthood of *Melchisedek*, before the law of *Moses* was given. And this may well be supposed, and moreover recorded to have been the practice of Christ and his Apostles. So to conclude this matter: as the people would not eat untill *Samuel* came, because he did bless the sacrifice, *1. Sam.* I hope there are none but *Anabaptists*, or ( who are the same with somewhat more learning, and more errors ) *Socinians*, that will presume to eat, unless a publick authoritative minister doth according to his peculiar dutie, bless the Sacrament.



## CHAP. X.

### *Of the twofold Resurrection.*

**F**OR distempered or greensick appetites that long for unwholesome food, you have in this chapter especially made provision: A thousand years reign upon earth, and all worldly felicitie before the day of judgement. But you say, “ though you speak  
“ besides the ordinary common roade, yet  
“ you trust not besides the Scriptures, nor  
“ the

“ the judgement of the ancient Ortho-  
 “ dox.

They had need be Scriptures of clear evidence, proof, that should be brought to call in question many principles of Divinitie plainly delivered in Holy writ, quite contrary to this millenarian fancie, that *Christ* should come from heaven, and raise the Saints and reign with them a thousand years; and after that space, the wicked should rise and receive sentence at the day of judgement.

*First*, The Scripture saith, *Act. 3. 21*. The heavens must contain *Iesus Christ* till the times of the restitution of all things: and in our Creed, we believe that *Christ from thence* that is, from heaven, shall come to judge the quick and dead. But by this opinion, he should continue on earth so many years, and then judge the world.

*Secondly*, The day of judgement is secret and unknown; shall be hid from the world, and come like a thief when men shall not think of it: but by this opinion all men shall know certainly when it shall come, namely at the term of a thousand years.

*Thirdly*, It makes two Resurrections of the body, one a great distance of time after the other. We beleeve but one Resurrection of the just, and of the unjust: the *Athanasian Creed* (at whose coming all shall arise with their bodies, they that have done good and they that have done evil.) The words are most clearly grounded upon what our Saviour saith,

*Job. 5. 28.* The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation. *Dan. 12. 2.* Many or the multitude of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And those that are *Christs*, and whom the Father hath given him, he will raise up *at the last day*, not at the first day of the Resurrection, as you imagine, *Those that are Christs at his coming, and the rest afterwards*: but beleivers shall be raised *at the last day*. *Job. 6.* four several times there it is so said, namely 39, 40, 44, 54 verses, I will raise him up *at the last day*. It is not the last day, if a thousand years follow. The trump of God, at the sound of which the dead shall rise, *1 Thess. 4.* is called the *last trumpet*. *1 Cor. 15. 52.* last, not because there were any time like before it, but because there shall be none after it: yea because there shall be nothing at all after it shall be in the last hour, when an end shall be put to all things in this world.

*Fourthly*, Our Saviour saith, *Job. 14. 3.* I will come again and receive you unto my self. Christ shall come back to take his disciples with him, not to abide with them upon earth, but to place them in the mansions of his fathers house, which he went to prepare for them.

*Fifthly*, This opinion makes the kingdom

God to be of this world, contrary to what our Saviour saith: and to consist in meat and drink, contrary to what the Apostle saith: whereas the children of the Resurrection shall be equal to the Angels, *Luke 20.36.* and the bodie raised shall be, not natural but a spiritual bodie, *1 Cor. 15. 44.* and therefore shall not need natural but spiritual refection and delight.

*Sixthly,* Whereas the Church of God is either militant or triumphant: either subject to temptations and exercised with crosses on earth, or else crowned with victory and glory in heaven: By this opinion the Church for so many years shall be neither, or betwixt both: out of heaven, but reigning on earth without sin, without ordinances. And whereas the Church of God upon earth is a mixt societie of good and bad, and is to continue such till the last, the tares must grow with the wheat till the harvest, which is the end of the world: by this opinion, the wheat shall grow alone without the tares, the just reign without the unjust, long before the final consummation.

And *Lastly,* According to the *Millenarians* new creed, the joy of the Saints in Gods presence, and the pleasures at his right hand shall not be for evermore, or perpetually continued; but be broken and intermitted, not with absolute misery, but with happines so far inferiour to that of heaven, in degree, and in kinde, that it may well be intermitted and taken for a degree of unhappines. When

*Peter* saw but a figure or glimpse of the celestial light he forgot all things, & would never by his good will have come down from the mount. And can we thinke that the glorified Saints, who are perfectly blessed with the sight of Gods face, shall be rewarded with leaving heaven, and coming down to enjoy the tasteless pleasures of an earthly Paradise?

Had you observed your own rule you gave before, page 11. [*Contrary to things plain and fundamentall, no difficult saying is to be interpreted, because it would be against the Analogie of Faith.*] you would never have suffered your self to be carry away with such a dream as this is. A very learned Commentatour, who telleth us, he bestowed about thirtie years studie upon the book of the Revelation, after all this faith, he found it an easier matter to say what the thousand years are not, than say what they are, or what is meant by them: and yet there lyes your greatest strength of *Chiliasm*. Saint *Pauls* Epistles are hard to be understood: you could once alledge it to weaken the testimonies taken thence. Is not *S. Johns Revelation*, especially the twentieth Chapter, much more hard? In your first chapter you could spy a mote of *Judaism*, where there was none: but behold a beam here which you would not see, while you interpret spiritual promises by a temporal kingdome, which is the main and blinding error of the *Jews* to this day.

Now I come to consider the Texts of Scripture upon which you ground this opinion.



“ 1 Cor. 15. 23. *Every man shall rise in his own order:* and is that onely the just? are they every man? *they that are Christs at his coming:* he says not then, all men at his coming, as men commonly say .]

Elsewhere it is said, All men, good and bad shall rise at his coming. I named before, *Joh. 5. 28.* I name now *Matth. 25. 31.* When the Son of man cometh, he shall separate one from another, as the shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats: must they not both be raised before they be separated? *2 Thess. 1.* It is righteous to recompence rest to you who are troubled, when the Lord *Jesus* shall be revealed from heaven, taking vengeance of them that know not God. *2 Tim. 4. 1.* *Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing:* if the quick and dead, then the unjust: and if they be judged, they must be raised first.

And *secondly*, whereas it is said; *Every man shall rise in his own order.* *Unusquisque*, Every one extendeth no further than to Christ and his bodie mystical: first Christ the Head, and then those that beleeve in him; not denoting any order in beleevers, as if one should rise before another; much less doth it extend to unbelievers, or shew how they shall rise: which is proved further, because *ver. 22.* *To be made alive*, as I take it, is never understood but of resurrection to life; to which standeth in opposition, resurrection to condemnation.

“ Why says Christ, he that doth good  
 “ shall be rewarded, *Luke 14. 14* at the  
 “ resurrection of the just, if the just and un-  
 “ just shall both rise together? why speaks  
 “ he of that as a distinct period?

He doth not speak of it as a distinct period of  
 time, but as of a distinct state. Many things may  
 differ very much, which yet may come to pass to-  
 gether. The prisoners that are innocent, or that  
 have obtained a pardon, may call the Assizes, the  
 time of enlargement and delivery; and yet upon the  
 very judgement-day, when they are acquitted and  
 sent home, other malefactours may be sent back to  
 prison and execution.

---

“ *1 Cor. 15. 24.* Then cometh the end,  
 “ when he shall have delivered up the king-  
 “ dome to God the Father. Now plain it  
 “ is that he shall not deliver up the king-  
 “ dome then when the just shall rise; for  
 “ they shall reign with him: wherefore also  
 “ it is said, He shall judge the quick and  
 “ the dead, at his coming and in his king-  
 “ dome, *2 Tim. 4. 1.* that implyes, that he  
 “ shall not deliver up the kingdom at his  
 “ coming, but when he hath reigned with  
 “ his Saints that here suffered with him.  
 “ If Death be put down at his coming,  
 “ where

“ where is his reign till that be put downe?

You loose your self and all that follow you in your confusions, while you choose rather to lead the ignorant, than to tread in the steps of the learned that have gone before you. There is a twofold kingdome of our Saviour Jesus Christ. The first, Natural, Absolute, and Essential to him as he is God, equal with the Father, with whom he reigneth from everlasting to everlasting: of this kingdome shall be no end, and as he never received it of any, so shall he never surrender it. The other is a Ministerial or Oeconomical Kingdome, belonging to him as he is Mediatour, having all power given him in heaven and earth, for the good and salvation of his Church, whereof he is the Head. This kingdome consisteth in dispensing his gifts diversly for the edification of his people by his Spirit, Word, Ministerie, and Ordinance, and in subduing Sin, Satan, Death, and all enemies of what kinde soever. This kingdome he hath received of his Father, and shall at last deliver it up. As if a king should give authority and commission to his eldest son, to go and reduce to due obedience a rebellious countrey, living at some distance: which work being done, the son returneth, renders up his Commission, delivers to his Father the possession of a peaceable kingdome; yet ceaseth not to be his Fathers son as he was before. The text you bring out of *2 Tim. 4. 1.* and that of *Rom. 8. 17.* and *2 Tim. 2. 11, 12.* do speak

speake of the first kinde of kingdome. But that of 1 Cor. 15. 24. speaketh of the second kinde of Kingdome, which shall at the end of the world cease; when the Churches warfare shall have an end, and her immediate communion with God shall begin; when the blessed and glorious Trinitie shall be all things in all men, shall supply the want or absence of all things: there shall not be ( because there shall be no need of them ) Magistrate, Minister, Word, Sacrament, Temple, Sun, or Moon.

*Then* cometh the end, you tell us that *then*, or *deinceps* should be *afterwards*: but others think it were better rendred *mox*, *statim*; that is, by and by, or presently after. “ Strange that the Apostle “ should say, *Every one in his own order*, and yet “ finde no order or time for the resurrection of the “ unjust; if there be, it is not mentioned with the “ just.]

*Answer.* Under this *Unusquisque*, no other are comprehended, but Christ & they that are Christs: the term here reacheth no further: you may finde just and unjust mentioned elswhere: *Acts 24. 15.* *I have hope towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.* The twentieth chapter of the *Revelation*, the fourth and sixth verses do imply two Resurrections, the first, and the last: yet not both of the bodie: but one of the soul from the death of sin and error during

ring this world: The other of the bodie out of the dust of the earth at the end of this world. These two resurrections are plain'y and distinctly laid down by our Saviour in the fifth chapter of *S. Johns Gospel*; the first in the 25 verse; *The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.* The second in the 28 and 29 verses, *The hour is coming, when all that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.*

- 
- “ It's a Resurrection after they had been  
 “ beheaded, and therefore not in this life  
 “ time: now if that be not the last Resurre-  
 “ ction: then there is a Resurrection follows  
 “ in which the rest shall rise, ver. 5. 12.

I answer, but I neither rehearse nor retort your insulting words. The fourth verse speaketh neither of bodies, nor of resurrection, but of souls onely and expressely, *I saw the souls of them that were beheaded, and they lived and reigned;* to wit in heavenly glorie: it is not said, they rose again, or lived again.

*But the rest of the dead lived not again.]* That is, Satan detained many still in Paganism, and Antichristianism, who would not rise out of sin and error.

*Until the thousand years were finished.]* That is,  
 Not

Not all that time of Satans binding: not that they rose afterward, but they rose not at all: it is not a limitation of the time, but an absolute denial.

*This is the first Resurrection.* ] Which is as if he had said thus; This living again that I speak of, is to be understood of the first Resurrection, which is from the death in sin: and I pray mark it well It is not the same life or kinde of living, that is affirmed of those in the fourth verse, and denied of those in the fifth; it is said of those, *quod vixerint*, that they *lived*: of these, *quod revixerint*, that they *lived again*. And betwixt these two there is not to be conceived any Synonymus contradiction, but a diversitie Metaphorical: Those in the fourth verse lived the life of glorie: those of the fifth verse did not arise or live again to the life of grace. And you unskilfully put together the fifth verse with the twelfth: whereas the fifth speaketh of the first Resurrection, the twelfth of the second or last, which is of the bodie at the day of Judgement.

Because you say, that though you speak besides the ordinary rode, yet you speak not besides the Scriptures. I would desire your scholars whom you instructed in the Doctrine of the Millenarians, though very obscurely in your Catechisme, and have added now an explication or vindication of it, That they would read over that chapter, which you refer them to, and which hath from the beginning of this error, been accounted the principal place of Scripture giving countenance to such belief

liefe: that is, the twentieth chapter of the *Revelation*. you say the dead in Christ shall rise first, and reign with him a thousand years, and then the rest shall rise to judgement of condemnation, by themselves apart. Now in reading this chapter, they shall finde, that after the thousand years are expired, there followeth, what? The Resurrection of the ungodly? no. But *Satan* loosed: *Gog* and *Magog* going forth to battel with armies of innumerable souldiers, making war against the Saints, and which are to be devoured with fire from heaven. And whence should these wicked ones be? there were none but the just living upon the earth: for the rest of the dead lived not again, for all that time. If they read on, to the 12 verse, there Saint *John* seeth the general judgement at the last, when both sea and land give up their dead, they were judged *every man*, according to their works, good as well as bad, and they were condemned who were not written in the book of life; not those who were not raised at the first Resurrection. And if the chief authority of Scripture for your opinion be so palpably impertinent, and the proof taken thence so weak; how weak is your opinion! So much for the Scriptures which you bring. Now we are to consider the judgement of the ancient orthodox.

---

“ To say nothing that *Justin Martyr*, one  
“ of the ancientest of the primitive writers,  
“ tells us that in his times all that were in  
“ all

“ all things orthodox Christians, so be-  
 “ leaved. *Dial.* with *Tryph.* So also *Ter-*  
 “ *tull.* lib. 3. contra *Marc.* and *Lactant.* lib.  
 “ 7. the Reader that hath the books may,  
 “ if he please, consult them, I study bre-  
 “ vitie.

You would not name *Cerinthus*, who was some-  
 what more ancient, though much more heterodox:  
 yet he it was who broached the opinion you speak  
 of: so witnesseth Saint *Augustine* in his eight book  
 of heresies. He held it indeed in a more gross man-  
 ner: some of the fathers following, refined it from  
 the more feculent parts. *Iustin Martyr* had it from  
 the Jews, with whom he conversed, and his opini-  
 on is meerly *Judaical*, that Jerusalem shall be  
 built again enlarged and beautified: and that the  
 Prophets and the Patriarchs, the Jews and the Pro-  
 felytes, who were before Christs coming, shall meet  
 there in a joyfull manner: but not that all they  
 who belong to Christ shall be raised with them, as  
 you teach. And *secondly*, you would not let us  
 know, because you studied brevity, what authori-  
 ties your authours had for that their belief, though  
 fairly, you give us leave to consult them. Now I  
 finde that the first place brought by the first of  
 your three, is out of *Isa.* 65. 22. *As the days of a*  
*tree are the days of my people* ] the meaning where-  
 of is to be gathered from the words next before:  
 the similitude is taken from the matter there spo-  
 ken



ken of: *They shall not plant, and another eat*: they shall not plant a tree, and then never live to taste of the fruit; but they shall last as long as the tree: so it follows in that verse, *They shall long enjoy the work of their hands*: as elsewhere, the just is compared to a tree for growth and continuance; so here he is compared to this tree here spoken of. Now your Authour, after the *Septuagint* readeth thus: *As the days of the tree of life so shall the days of my people be.* The days of the tree of life, he understood to be a thousand years, which Adam should have lived had he not transgressed the law given. But eating of the other tree, the tree of knowledge, he could never attain to that age, nor any of his posteritie. But *that* he took to be the age that men should live to, after the first Resurrection. *Thirdly*, In those words of his ὁ δὲ τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰς κρίσεις καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰς κρίσεις you are to know that [καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰς κρίσεις] is restrictive; he doth not say that all Christians held it, but they that were *in all things* orthodox, did hold it, because he held it himself, and therefore held that to be a part of orthodoxy: But some who were orthodox, but not *in all things*, did not hold it: for you may read a little before that he confesseth, *Multos verò qui pura pieque sunt Christianorum sententia, hoc non agnoscere*, Many pious and right good Christians did not acknowledge so much, not regarding what some thought who were called Christians, but were impious Atheists, and blasphemous, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς καὶ τὰς κρίσεις, every way, or in

in all things. And that learned writer, who would without so much as pretending any copie, insert a negative, *ὁ μὴ καὶ οὕτως*, doth make *Justin* speak to this effect, some blasphemous Atheists are orthodox Christians, but not in all things. Not those that are *in all things impious*, but those that are *in some things orthodox*, must stand in opposition to that limitation, *in all things orthodox*. *Tertullian* held this opinion too, but it was when he was not a man of the Church, but had fallen to *Montanism*, and this was a piece of his *Montanism* too, as he saith in his third book against *Marcion*, cap. 24. *Novæ prophetiæ sermo testatur*: it was witnessed by the new prophesie: but this we might not know because you were in haste. *Lactantius* also was of this minde, but his chief proofs, were partly from the *Sibyls*, with Virgils Eclogue, and partly from the prophesies of the old Testament, which he understood literally and marvelously: whereas we be taught by the Apostle *Peter*, Act. 2. 16. and by the Apostle *James*, Act. 15. 15. to apply those prophesies to the time of the new Testament, or Christs first, not his second coming.

Now because you give this regard to ancient writers, and the ages foregoing, I will produce one argument of this kinde against your *Millenarian* belief, and then conclude this chapter: and it is this. That opinion which was generally condemned by the Church of Christ, and was afterwards upheld by none for above the space of a thousand years,

no Catholick doctrine, nor sound belief: But this opinion that Christ Jesus should raise his Saints, and reign with them upon earth for the space of a thousand years, being condemned, was not held by any for above the space of a thousand years: Therefore it is no Catholick doctrine. The *Major* I hope needeth no proof with you at this time: but because it may seem not safe or good discretion to adventure much upon a Negative; I desire leave to mollifie and interpret the *Minor* with this request, that I may have libertie to think so, untill you be able to produce some instance to the contrarie. And the space I mean, is that betwixt *S. Hierom* who opposed it, and the *Anabaptists* who revived it. And if there be any policie in the *Papists* coyning the lives of some of our Reformers to discredit their doctrine, I am sure it is no credit to any opinion to claim parentage or resuscitation from the *Anabaptists*.



## CHAP. XI.

*How God had power enough to help man.*

TO the Question, *What God had done for man?* when part of your Answer was, That God had power enough to help him: Inoted, that though your Answer was true, yet it seemed to argue thus:

H

H:

*He can do it, therefore he hath done it* ; which I said is not safe. And I suspected a dark insinuation of this, that God had done all he could do to help man being fallen. Hereupon in this Chapter, although you are angrie with me for collecting any such thing, so much as by way of intimation from your words. And although secondly, you charge the adverse partie with thinking so; yet in the third place, you own and acknowledge it to be true, what I said might be darkly gathered from your Answer, and you think it must pose me, and all men else to tell, *What he could have done more*; as if you cared not what you say, so you may revile and contradict. It must be left to the Reader to compare the first of these with the third, and to judge whether there be wrong offered to you, or to your companion, who would not beleieve but that God releev'd the whole world, when he had means and opportunity, you needed not to except against me for saying, That in things of this world we walk by sight: and to say that it seems *I walk so, rather then by faith*. The Apostle Paul did walk by Faith, and gives this the reason why he did so, because he was absent from the Lord, and saw him not; but in things of this life he did walk by sight. Be pleased therefore to know, that in that saying of the Apostles, 2 Cor. 5. 7. *We walk by faith, not by sight*; the word *Faith* is taken in a proper and strict meaning, as it stands opposed to sight, and it is called the evidence of things not seen. In things of this present world

we walk by sight, not by faith: not by faith strictly taken, yet by faith largely taken, we may walk in this life, and yet walk by sight too, like as *Thomas* both saw and beleaved. *August. Enchirid. 8. Melius hanc appellamus Fidem, quàm divina eloquia docuerunt, earum scilicet rerum quæ non videntur: It is best to call that by the name of Faith, which is of things not seen, as holy Scripture useth to speak.*

You prove that your Adversaries hold, God cannot help the most part of men, because *Dr. K.* said, *He can have no new immanent Act of will: "So then that onely which he hath willed he can do,]"* and (our partie may answer) *He had not power "enough", for he cannot will anew concerning them, "and he had so willed already as to tie his hands.]"*

You seem to speak both ignorantly and unreverently of Gods Attributes. It is no wonder you should be jealous of *our* liberty, who are afraid lest Gods Decrees should deprive him of his own Libertie and Power, as if his hands were tied, if he may not repent, and do what formerly he intended not to do. Libertie is, to be at ones own determination; whereas you make it all one with inconstancie, or changeableness of purpose and resolution. His hands are tied, who cannot do what he would do, or who is hindred from using the power that he hath: not who will not do what he can do, or that abideth constant to his purpose. *Omniscience* and *Omnipotence*, together with all manner of perfection, are an infallible argument or proof, as

well as a cause of Unchangeableness. The Roman *Lelius* intending a good work for the Commonwealth, and the benefit of the poor; when he found that he was over-powred by a contrary faction of the wealthier sort, would move no further in it, but let it fall; and because he did so, he gained the name of *Sapiens*, and was called afterward *Lelius the wise*. It is oftentimes a part of wisdom in man, to alter his intention, and enter into new counsels: but such wisdom it is as is accompanied with some weakness or other, as of ignorance, or improvidence, or impotence: all which, and all the like are far removed from the infinite majesty of God. If any understanding man upon deliberation, and choice, and good reason resolveth to do or not to do this or that, are his hands now bound from doing the contrary? It hath pleased God thus far to reveal his minde, that he will have mercie upon whom he will have mercie: and can you now say to any man, according to the tenour of the doctrine you oppose, God will have no mercy on you; he is not able to help you, he hath otherwise determined? you cannot. But you may bethink your self how you can answer to God, for thus traducing his secret will, with which he hath forbidden you to meddle, having reserved it to himself, together with the reason and account of his judgements, which are as the great depth, and ought to be trembled at: but you should not talk of them in so taunting a manner as you do in this Section.

*Seet. 3.* See then Reader, if their Divinitie give not indeed cause for *Epicurean* Atheism, to live as they list, and take their destinie; saying as *Seneca* *Datum fata sinunt vivite Lati---* *Nec illa Deo vertisse licet* *Qua nexa suis currunt causis.* Surely this is liker an old chip of the *Manichees* or *Stoicks* fate, then any thing I said, or *M. G.* looks like *Marcion.*]

You and your Divinitie finde more solace in *Seneca's Hercules furens*, or *Lucians* *Zeu*, than in Gods holy word, whatsoever you pretend and promise. *Job* saith, chap. 23. v. 13. He is in one minde, and who can turn him? what his soul desireth that he doeth: he performeth the thing that is appointed for me. The Apostle *Paul* saith, *Eph. 1. 11.* He worketh all things according to the power of his own will. And can you say, that God doth not ordinate, dispose, and over-rule the actions of wicked men to his glory? To deny Gods Providence is impious: To call it *Stoical* fate, is profane, and belongeth to profane noveltie of words. There be many differences betwixt *Heaven's* fate or destinie, and divine Providence; yet named one even now, though it may be unawares, *Nec illa Deo vertisse licet.* As it differed from their God, or gods, so it over-ruled them, and they stood in awe of it. But God is not subject to his Providence; but his Providence is his will, that is, His

self, And here your followers may be pleased to take notice whom you follow: and if they cannot know you by your self, they may know you by your companions. You follow the *Pelagians*. *Alvarez de Auxil. 1. 1. §. 9. Pelagius hanc conclusionem inferebat, si asseratur quod Gratia Dei humana merita antecedit, & ex nolentibus volentes faciat, per talem gratiam libertas destruitur humani arbitrii, & necessitas fatalis inducitur.* *Pelagius* reasoned thus, If Gods Grace go before mans works, and of unwilling makes us willing, such Grace destroyeth the libertie of mans will, and bringeth in fatal necessity. *Here the Reader may see whom you look like.*

Now because you have of your courtesie found out a parallel for our partie, the sect of the *Stoicks*, and have in this your piece minded us of it thrice already; we do accept it, and we do own it, so far as we may; and where we may not, we refuse it, and return it to you again.

*First*, It is well done of you, that you compare us with those Philosophers that were *Dogmatici*, that did admit and retain peremptorily some opinions, and as resolutely refuse some other: and that you do not liken us to those sects, whose profession consisted either in arguing about the truth on both sides: or in perpetual seeking after it: or in doubting of it: or in contemning of it, as not worth the seeking. Your partie hath for a long time been charged to be too much distant from the *Stoicks* in this and to incline too far to those that were called *Sec-*



ticks: while they have pleaded, that there is no infallible judgement upon earth: and that as we condemn others, so others condemn us, with such like goodly reasons as these, in behalf of indifferencie in Religion. When *Erasmus* said, he was not for his part much delighted in positive assertions; *Luther* told him it was not spoken like a Christian. *Non est hoc Christiani pectoris non delectari assertionibus: Absint à nobis Sceptici & Academici. Adsint relapsis Stoicis bis pertinaciores assertores. Tolle assertiones & Christianismum tulisti.* Of all the sects the Scepticks and the Epicureans were most contrary to Christian Religion. *Castellio* that great Christian, at least as some have lately called him, howbeit he was so violent and fierce against his Adversarie, as if he had felt the ground he stood on; yet telleth plainly his own minde, *Nondum nota veritas est:* The Truth is not yet known; *de Qu. Imped. p. 22.* So it might be the Truth he opposed for ought he knew. But *Socinus*, who taking another name put forth those works, saith *Cloppenburgh*, would assure us, that though we attain not to know the truth thereby, we shall clearly perceive what is not the truth. So that the power he had, was onely for the demonstration of Errour, not for edification in the Truth, as great a Christian as he was.

Secondly, the *Stoicks* were the most serious and severe of all the Philosophers, the most religious and devout, the most patient, just, and sober that were

to be found among the heathens. Let *Seneca*, *Epictetus*, and *M. Antoninus*, in what they have left upon record, be witnesses for themselves, and somewhat also for the rest. The which I alledge now, not intending to make any comparison between one partie and another: but to this end onely, to note that their opinion of *Destinie* and *Fatalitie*, was no manner of hindrance to pietie and vertue; and to prove that it is a wicked slander to teach or imply, that the Doctrine of Gods Predestination is a principle breeding profaneness and a vicious life. But to say that it causeth *Epicurean Atheism*, is a senseless slander: for *Epicurus* quite contrarie to *Zeno's fate*, set up Fortune to be a governess of the world, and held that the gods took no heed to what men did upon earth, but suffered all things to run at random. And shall that opinion that ascribeth too much to Gods Providence, as if he did all things whatsoever, and necessitated men to sin, as you blasphemously infer; breed in men an opinion, that he doeth nothing at all, and not so much as regardeth what men do? Shall Christian *Stoicism* breed *Epicurean Atheism*? here you did strike and lay about you blindfold. They who were most contrarie to the *Stoicks*, and opposite in the extreme, were most swinish and brutish in their lives. Away therefore with this your slander, I know not whether more shameless or senseless.

*Thirdly*, the *Stoicks* were most constant assertours and most strenuous defenders of that which we

call *Free-will*, and they called *ἡ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*, meaning thereby that power which every man hath over his own minde, and over his own actions. It is therefore another slander, to teach that the doctrine of the divine Decrees doth deprive men of their libertie, and maketh them rather to be stocks then voluntary agents. Mans *will* may be and always is free, as to that root of libertie which is essential to man, though his *Person* in the mean time, be in slavery or bondage to sin and vice.

Fourthly, The *Stoicks*, as they taught fate, so they taught withall *confatalia*, divers other things attending upon fate: which we call *means*. Whereby that which is fatal or decreed to come to pass, shall indeed, when due time is, be brought to pass. *Seneca Natur. Quest. lib. 2. c. 38. Fatum est ut hic desertus sit; sed si literas didicerit: ab eodem fato con- jectur ut literas discat; ideo discet.* If it be any mans fate to be a learned man; it is in his fate also that he apply himself to his studie: and therefore he shall do so: and herein they accorded with our Religion. A good Christian never said nor thought; if I be chosen to heaven I shall be saved, whether I live well or ill; because he is taught that God did from the beginning, choose to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth, *2 Thess. 2. 13.* So when the time cometh, he giveth those things that pertain to Godlineis as well as life, and calleth to vertue as well as glory, *2 Pet. 1. 3.* And a rational Christian will never object and cavil, say- ing;

ing; If men did know that they be ordained to life eternal, it is the next way to make them neglect godliness and holy conversation: for he that speaks thus, probably speaks against his own conscience: which I prove thus: if this man were infallibly and undoubtedly assured by a divine prophesie, that his son being now but young, should hereafter when he shall attain to full ripeness of age, be advanced to some chief place of judicature in the State, or some chief preferment in the Church; he would not thereupon grow negligent in bestowing that cost and culture which is requisite upon that his son: but I am certain he would the more diligently and more vigorously and chearfully take care for his liberal education, that he may be fitted and qualified for such promotion. And give what instance you will, you shall without fail finde it true, that the assurance or confidence that any man hath of accomplishing any purpose, end, or design, doth sharpen his endeavour, and encourage him, in prosecuting those means, by which such a design is usually brought to pass.

This being the doctrine of your pretended orthodox, and this the nature and consequence of it, I pray you what may we think of *Tilenus* and his favourable summarie of the Synod in the late *History of the five Articles*, 1. pag. 41. giving in for the result of the first Article of the five, that God elected to salvation a very small number of men (*without any regard to their faith or obedience whatsoever*)

(never) whereas the Canons, which surely are the Result, speak quite contrary, by name the eight Canon of the first Article. *Scriptura unicum predicat beneplacitum, propositum, & consilium voluntatis Dei, quo nos ab aeterno elegit, & ad gratiam, & ad gloriam, & ad salutem & ad viam salutis*: there is not a two-fold election, purpose, or counsel of God, but One; even that whereby he chooseth both to Grace and Glory, to Salvation, and the way that leadeth to Salvation. ] Such dealing may be left off, out of honesty, by them who think it is any credit to their cause to use it.

Thus far we are not, neither need we to be ashamed of being, *Stoical*: if therefore you think good at any time to represent us as Stoicks, let not them, let not us be misreported: for both acknowledge libertie of will: and both acknowledge a necessary connexion of the Decree, and the intervening means: and if you say otherwise, you wrong them and us, and all those that take things on your word.

But besides these particulars now named, the *Stoicks* had a high conceit of the freedome of their will, determinately to good. They imagined that they had power to frame and fashion themselves anew, as it were to the highest degree of vertue, that mans nature is capable of. *Seneca Epist. 41. Stultum est optare cum possis à te impetrare. non sunt ad cælum elevandæ manus.* It is a foolish part for a man

man to pray for what he may have of himself. And Ep. 31. *Exurge modo & te quoque dignum finge Deo* Now here we leave them, and the free-will of theirs, and I leave it to you to consider, who they be, that are nearest of kin to them: and who they be, the face and scope and import of whose doctrine, may be thought to draw nearest to them. So much for *Stoicism*.

You charge us with *Manicheism* also. But you tell us not wherein. Those that have reckoned up above twenty heresies that *Manes* held, have told us that it were an endless thing to reckon them all. If it be that about *Free will*, that you mean, I did say but little, yet enough for that matter, in my *Review*, pag. 144. And according to what in the next chapter following this you tell me, pag. 58. It is a weakness to bring an argument, or charge, which you know I have answered, and yet to take no notice of the answer ] as you do not, neither here, nor yet in your 27 chapt. where is the proper place, if any thing you had to say to it.

But I would gladly ask you, whether you know any man, that has so much impudence, as to say, that S. *Augustine* was a *Manichean*: if he were, how comes it to pass, that he was so great an adversarie to that sect: if he were not, how come those men to be *Manicheans* whose Doctrine is the same that his was, as I hope you have so much modestie as to acknowledge what danger they are in to fall into *Manicheism*, or something that is worse, who

who denie Gods Providence in the evil of sin, so  
as commonly they do denie it. I wish they would  
seriously consider and beware. So much for *Mani-  
heism*.

“ Verily all my instructions given to seek  
“ the Lord, imply that I think, God can  
“ do more than he hath done. Though  
“ what he could have done more for our re-  
“ demption, and for providing salvation for  
“ us, than to have given his onely son to  
“ death for us, and raise and glorifie him,  
“ as he hath done, I suppose, must pose all  
“ men, when the time comes, when God  
“ will be cleared in his sayings, and in his  
“ doings, and that shall be his appeal. Judge  
“ between me and my vineyard, what more  
“ could have been done &c. and that to  
“ little comfort to the censurers of his  
“ goodness now, which we desire, toge-  
“ ther with his power and wisdom to  
“ adore. ]

Whether or no, you have and how far, in this  
chapter, impeached three of Gods most sacred at-  
tributes, namely. *First*, his Immutabilitie, while  
you reckon it for an error to say, that he cannot  
will anew. *Secondly*, his Providence, while you  
compare it with the *Stoicks* fate. *Thirdly*, his Om-  
nipotence,

nipotence, while you speak as if he could do more than he hath done for mans salvation, whatsoever he is able to do for other things; This leave to others to judge, who are more able to judge and whom it better becometh to give their censure. Of this I am well assured, that without doing wrong, more or less, to these three aforesaid, and divesting God of them so far, as to think him like our selves in things which argue our imperfection, which the fiftieth Psalm reproveth as wickedness: The Remonstrants Divinitie can never consist, nor hold together while the world standeth. And of these three attributes, I understand the second, namely Gods Providence, to comprehend 1. his seeing and foreseeing all things 2. his upholding or maintaining all things, in their being and actions. 3. his orderly directing and governing all things, to his own ends, and according to his own will. Yea, whosoever looketh into the writings and is not partial, will soon perceive what expence they are continually put to, in making good their first breach; what waste and havock they make of their old stock and patrimonie to maintain the title of their late purchase. And you show your self as bad as the worst of them, in giving such a maim and imperfect enumeration of the means and helps that God hath afforded to salvation. [*He hath given his Son to death, raised him, and glorified him*] and here you stay and tell us, there is more that could be done, very offensively; yet



ing us fairly leave to gueſs, when at other times,  
 you ſpeak of any further help, or grace, or ſtrength,  
 and divine aſſiſtance; whether thereby you mean  
 any thing, or nothing.

The means to life eternal, are of two ſorts. The  
 firſt called *Media immediata*, or *Media interna*: in-  
 ternal and immediate means, by which a Chriſtian  
 is placed and ſet in the ſtate of regeneration, and  
 made ſpiritual, as Faith, Repentance, Sanctification,  
 and Juſtification, theſe are proper to the Church  
 viſible, or myſtical bodie of Chriſt. The ſecond,  
*Media mediorum*, or *Media externa*, outward means  
 tending to produce the former ſort of means; as  
 not onely Preaching of the Goſpel, ſending of Pa-  
 ſtours, Adminiſtration of the Word and Sacra-  
 ments, which are common to the Church viſible;  
 but moreover, the Incarnation of Chriſt, his Paſſi-  
 on and Reſurrection, which are in ſome ſort, and in  
 ſenſe formerly explained, common to all the  
 world. Now you have omitted the former ſort of  
 means, and mentioned onely this latter and moſt  
 remote, of Chriſts Death and Riſing again; as if  
 you had rather follow *Puccius* and *Huberus*, whom  
 both Papiſt and Lutheran count Monſters, than  
 conform to the Doctrine of the reformed  
 Churches.

It is a Cuſtom, with you, and with other men of  
 your minde, to deface and obſcure Gods Grace, by  
 diſcourſe tending to ſet forth his Mercy and Good-  
 neſs, and Love to all mankind. But ſuch Mercy

it is, by which none are saved: no man is brought to heaven by universal Grace, or that sufficient Help, that is given to all men. You may, for that matter, beleeve your Dutchman in his *Diatriba* pag. 17. *Divitias illas bonitatis divinae omnes fastidirent, nisi abundans misericordia Dei quosdam selectos separasset, quibus efficacem vocationem, ac finalis perseverantiam, dare ab aeterno decrevisset, praeteritis aliis quos demum propter impaenitentiam & infidelitatem esset damnaturus.* The riches of Gods goodness would be despised and abused even by all men, unless the mercy of God had set apart and chosen some, upon whom he did decree from eternitie to bestow effectual vocation and final perseverance in Grace, while he passed by others, who at last are to be condemned for their impenitence and unbelief. This Doctrine therefore that you so zealously obtrude upon the world, is no such friend to the world as may be imagined. For while you plead for some kinde of intention and will that God hath to save all men, you do withall, violently plead against any absolute intention he hath to save any man in particular. *Corvinus* contr. *Molin.* cap. 12. §. 25, 26. *Admittimus, fieri potuisse, ut nemo in Christum crederet: ut nulla sit Ecclesia.* We grant it follows from what we teach, that there may be no Church at all, and not one true beleever. And it cannot well be otherwise, because the preventing Grace you speak of, (I mean those of your minde) is no other than is given in the first Covenant, whereby God doth teach,

teach and instruct, command and forbid, and threaten and promise. All this was done in the covenant of works, in which yet they continued not, *Hebr.* 8. 9. And if it be not this grace you mean, why should you bring the examples of the Angels in heaven, and *Adam* in Paradise, to prove the Apostasie of Saints; and that true grace may fail? And doubtless should man be left *now* as he was at the first creation, *in manu consilii sui*, *Eccelus* 15. in the hand of his counsel, (a place commonly brought to the present purpose) he must needs be seduced *now*, who fell when he had a far greater stock of strength wherewithall to resist and stand. And as the grace you plead for, and the onely grace you think is to be had, is the same by which *Adam* stood, and notwithstanding which he fell; so is it no other nor better than that grace which is bestowed upon the reprobates; for whom your Adversaries do beleeve, Christ did and doth as much as you hold he did and doth for the elect: both the one and the other being left to their own freedome, and to their own power, of Beleeving, and repenting, and Persevering, and then it may readily be decided, to which doctrine the world is most beholden. We are on both sides agreed that Christ died for all men, on condition of their faith in him; we say that every man shall be pardoned that beleeveth: and you will not say that any man shall be pardoned and saved, whether he beleeve or no. Thus far we differ not. But when it cometh to the questi-

on, Whether the Son of God did merit for us the grace of Faith, and Regeneration and Perseverance; we maintain that he merited these for his elect: and you utterly denie that he merited these for any: and then it may easily be decided, after all the idle and emptie words that are commonly taken up, who they are that most straiten the merits of Christ, and who are most forward to denie the benefits of his passion.

But the Text in *Iſai* 5. is often alledged and insisted on, and by you twice in this chapter; *What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done?* Where *First*, you are to note, that it is an enclosure, it is a vineyard that is spoken of, therefore no Universalist must draw this beyond the bounds of the Church, or make use of it to prove that all men have sufficient help to salvation. The vineyard of the Lord of hosts, is the house of Israel, and he dealeth not so with every nation as he did with that nation.

*Secondly*, It is granted there could no more be done then was done, for external means and helps exhibited to a visible, national, constituted Church namely, for Doctrine, Sacraments, Prophets, Pastors, Miracles, and manifold mercies and encouragements. But is there nothing more to be done or could there nothing more be done towards the bringing forth fruit to life eternal? *Paul* may plant, *Apollos* may water, but God giveth the increase. If it pleased God, whose will is always just, though

it may be secret to us, at that time by the ministerie of his servants, and mercies of divers kinds, to plant and to water the Church of *Judab* and *Ierusalem*, and not to give encrease, must it needs be indeed because he could not do it? yes, at least so we are told. He may be allowed to be able to force an ordinarie natural vineyard to bring forth good grapes, but to a *Rational vineyard* he could not do it. So that the Question is not now, what God *doeth*, or *hath done* for his Church, or lost mankind; that is a modest inquiry: but it is affirmed broadly, He *could not* do more than he hath done. I think we may boldly say, *A few such propositions as this is, are competent to blast and defame any cause that stands in need of such supporters.*

We have often heard it affirmed to this purpose, That God could not create *Adam* in a state free from danger and possibilitie of falling into sin; because this had been to make him unchangeable, which God onely is. Whereas there is nothing can be imagined but God can do it, if it please him to do so, both in heaven and earth, unless such things as do import either impotence in the Creatour, or contradiction in the creature: but what had there been of the one or the other if by his Grace and Power he had kept the understanding of *Adam* from being overclouded with error, his will and affections in perfect and entire obedience? no more than there was in the Angels that fell not, or than there shall be in preserving the elect for ever in heaven, God

is onely wise, and onely hath *immortality*, we may add and *immutability* : of himself, and independently, perfectly, and infinitely : yet he hath by Communication, made the Angels and spirits of men wise and immortal; so he might have made *Adam* unchangeably good, though not unchangeable as He himself is. And such Doctrine as you here deliver, and some others teach agreeably hereunto, is no way consonant to Christian belief: for as it doth too plainly denie Gods omnipotence, contained in the first Article of our *Creed*; so doth it also directly run counter to those many promises where God hath said, he will do that which you say he cannot do; as namely that in *Jeremy* 32. 40. *I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*

At the end of this chapter, “ You desire to adore Gods goodness, power, and wisdom. There be other Attributes of God to be thought on, and to be adored; as his unchangeableness, and his justice, commonly called in Scripture *Wrath* whereby he punisheth sinners. Which though you named not here, yet you might well have named them in your Catechisme, where I scarce finde any more than these three in that description of God which you set down.

Qu. 12. “ *What shouldst thou remember, mind or consider in God?*

A. “ His Power, Wisdom, and Goodness exercised for and about me, his will concerning me and end to which he made me.] There

There be few Catechists (if there be any) that speaking of Gods Attributes reckon up so few as these, or that make mention of Goodness, but none of Justice, or some thing equivalent. The Apostle, *Rom. 11. 22.* propoundeth the Goodness, and the Severity of God equally to be considered and adored: and *Marcion*, as *Tertullian* witnesseth, *lib. 1. c. 25. Removit à Deo severitates*: considered onely in God his Goodness, and nothing over against it: all Goodness, no Severity. I lay not this opinion to you: but thus much I say, This dealing of yours looks more like *Marcion*, than any thing your Adversaries have said, doth look like the *Manichees*.



## CHAP. XII.

### *Of Universal Redemption.*

IN the differences that are about the point of Universal Redemption, I had some hope that you and I should have been upon a reasonable good accord. But it falls out quite otherwise: for as you tell me, page 60. that I beleeve it because the Church believes it [*for the veneration of the Church*]. So now you will not hold it because I hold it, but you argue diversly against it, page 57. But if you bring arguments against your own opinion, you must answer them your self, because I know no bodie will

do it for you, and then the solutions will please you the better, because they are your own.

---

*Seēt. 3.* “ In adding that as the reason  
 “ why the ranfome is not profitable to a  
 “ men to eternal life, because it is not given  
 “ to all men to beleieve, he innovates from  
 “ the Scripture, which no where assignes  
 “ that as the cause, but mens not receiving  
 “ the grace of God.

Divers things may concur to one effect: and may be said, because one of them is wanting, the effect is not produced. A souldier may die of a dangerous, but curable wound received in the field, this is the true cause of his death: but may it not be said truly, that he lost his life because he wanted a Chirurgion? and a traytour is executed because he wanted a pardon. Mans infidelitie is the cause why he receives not benefit by Christs death, but may not be said withall, that he receives not benefit by it, because it is not given him to beleieve? But *innovate from Scripture.* I wish you would once leave your wonted manner of making people thinke you keep your self more punctually to Scripture than others do. Let the words of *Moses* be considered, Deut. 29. 4. *The Lord hath not given you heart to perceive, and eyes to see.* Though great signs and miracles were wrought before their eyes, yet



they perceived them not, because God gave them not to perceive. Let those words of our Saviour be considered, giving the reason why his heavenly doctrine was revealed to some, and not to others: it was not onely because some gave better ear then others did; but, *So it seemed good in thy sight*, Matth. 11. 26. and those words of his, Joh. 10. 26. *You beleeve not, because you are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. Sheep*, that is, say you elsewhere, *meekened and made docible*: then look to the 16. verse, *Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, the I must bring*. Were the Gentiles yet uncalled, meekened and made docible already? No. By *sheep* therefore are meant *elect*, such as belonged to God by election, without reference to any sheep-like disposition found in them before they were brought. In Gods counsel they appertained to his flock, according as the elect in *Corinth* are called his people: *Acts* 18. 10. *I have much people in this citie*: not with reference to any *frames* or *qualities* they had before they were called. And I pray marke those words, [*as I said unto you;*] but where was that said? that we may the better gather the meaning of what is said here. I will refer you, who would be thought not to swerve the least from what you finde in Scripture, to Joh. 8. 47. and Joh. 6. 36. *Ye have seen me and beleeve not: All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me*. To come, is to beleeve: and they come whom God doth give, and none else; and they whom God giveth were his. Joh. 17. 6. *Thine*

*they were, and thou gavest them me.* These be the causes you finde in Scripture, no other frames and dispositions, why one beleeveth and another not.

*Sect. 3.* You lay down considerations touching *Gods giving Faith*; The sum is this.

“ He giveth Faith to all that hear the  
 “ word, as well to them that beleeve not, as  
 “ to them that beleeve; as he gave the Is-  
 “ raelites Manna lying before them upon  
 “ the ground: they might take it if they  
 “ would; if they would not take it, they  
 “ might leave it. Mans not having doth  
 “ not argue Gods not giving. The sluggard  
 “ cannot say, God gave him not provision,  
 “ when he might have had it, would he  
 “ have laboured for it.]

And where is now that malicious and slanderous Adversary that dareth to accuse you, as if you taught that Faith is not Gods gift? God gave Faith to *Judas*, but he would not take it, as he giveth the slothfull man bread that starveth for want of it, because he will not stretch forth his hand to labour. He likewise gave Faith to *Peter*, as he giveth to the diligent hand that maketh rich. With you, or in your doctrine, To give, is no more than to offer: but in good, common, and ordinary sense, That which is offered may be rejected: but that which

is not received, cannot be said to be given. And still you presuppose that man hath always spiritual life, and can come when he is called, and can take what is tendred to him, and can eat what is set before him: Whereas if you did not *innovate from Scripture*, you might learn and teach others, How Faith which is said to be Gods gift, is the chief part of that spiritual life by which a Christian liveth: and that very hand by which he receiveth and layeth hold of Gods promises: and that appetite of the soul, by which it longeth after the heavenly bread. And untill this be obtained, all that is said or done, or propounded by way of Object to mans heart, is no other than *appositiones epularum circumposita sepulchro*, as messes of meat set upon a grave, or a banquet that is offered to an idol, that can neither eat nor smell. I am sure you innovate and invert the Apostles words, who saith thus, *It is not of him that willeth, but of God that sheweth mercy*. But you say to this effect, That this man is saved, and not another, it is not of God that sheweth mercie, for he sheweth mercie to all: but it is of man that willeth and accepteth his mercie. It is not of God that giveth, but of man that taketh: for God giveth to all that will take. And when the Apostle Paul saith thus to Timothy, [ *if God peradventure will give them repentance* ] his meaning must be but this: If it pleaseth God to propound to their minds such reasons and arguments, that would prevail with those that are disposed as they ought to be.

be. A thing which *Timothy* himself might do well enough. But when he saith, *Si fortè; If peradventure*, he intendeth some singular and rare matter, and of great difficulty, scarce to be hoped for; not a common gift, vouchsafed to all that hear and are outwardly called.

---

“ It is well said it is given to you to be-  
 “ leeve or suffer : but it follows not, that  
 “ God either did not, or would not have gi-  
 “ ven the same to others, in the serious  
 “ listening to him : in the means and Spi-  
 “ rits concomitancie therewith given. All  
 “ that come are drawn, it follows not, all  
 that are drawn come. ]

But who giveth the serious listening you speak of? Who giveth eyes to see, and ears to hear, and a heart to perceive? Whatsoever your concessions be, or how far soever you yeeld, you take care not to endanger nor part with your beloved Principle though never so rotten. It must be of man that willeth, and of man that listeneth, why one belee- veth, and another not.

“ The Spirits concomitancy therewith given they should speak of this, that hold any such thing needfull, beside the word for producing faith, but you draw so deep of the Socinian lees, as to count them breeders of *Fanaticks* that hold it. I deny not

but th  
 causet  
 on, in  
 univer  
 their l  
 is sow  
 taker  
 of the  
 third  
 such a  
 word,  
 panie  
 ficacie  
 salvat  
 were  
 and w  
 saved.  
 “  
 be so  
 other  
 John  
 and v  
 given  
 man t  
 No m  
 give,  
 port.  
 and li  
 Yo  
 this w

but there is a working of the spirit of God, which causeth some degree of illumination and conviction, in the hearts of the hearers ordinarily, but not universally: for some hear and understand not, their hearts being like the high way, the seed that is sown, the wicked one catcheth away, and it taketh no manner of place at all: and in the *Acts of the Apostles*, some beleaved, others doubted, a third sort mocked. But though there be ordinarily such a working of the spirit accompanying the word, yet I utterly denie that this is always accompanied with that saving and quickning power or efficacie which causeth true faith, and is sufficient to salvation; for it were sufficient and universal, if it were able to remove mans rebellious disposition, and were granted to all, then all men would be saved. For what should hinder?

“ Not all that are drawn come ] whether that be so or no, may soon be known by considering other expressions of the same thing, in that place, *John 6.37. All that the Father giveth shall come.* and v. 65. *No man can come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father.* and v. 45. *Every man that hath heard and learned, cometh,* and v. 44. *No man can come except the Father draw him.* To give, and to draw, and to teach, are of the same import. All that are given, and all that are taught, and likewise all that are drawn, do come.

Your Masters have thought that they eluded this word of *Drawing*, and fairly came off, from all force

force of argument from thence, when they found out that it was to be interpreted by *teaching*, in the very next verse following, *they shall be all taught of God*: not remembring that Gods teaching is not like mens: and that none teacheth like him. No, nor so much as considering, how that it follows in that very verse, *Every man that hath heard and learned cometh*. Which, as it wholly overthroweth that evasion of theirs, manifestly alio sheweth the falshood, and absurditie of what you here say, not all that are drawn, come.

In your 8 *Section*, you yield that Gods Grace doth remove infidelitie, but not give faith, unless thus explicated [ “ Faith or power to beleeve ] this I take to be all one with what some others say, that He doth not give *credere*, but onely *posse credere*, and for this you quote, *Hos. 11. 4*. I did take off the yoke on their jaws and laid meat before them. This is spoken of the civil state of the *Israelites*: and when you have made it appear that the yoke there mentioned is to be taken for a muzzel, you are driven to betake your self to a *vein of allegorizing*, for proof of your opinion, when it is well known that many plain and direct places prove the contrary. Your other texts shew what God doth outwardly to a Nation or Church visible: but do not shew, that he doth no more than so, in the conversion of a particular person.

“ *sect. 9.* Therefore he may think with himself, if I be of the former, I must be brought in, take what course I will; and if of the other, I must perish take the best course I can. Therefore I had as good take the present good things, while I may have them, and live as I list. ]

He must needs be a man absurd and unreasonable, and for the time given over of God, that shall in earnest speak in his heart after this manner. And if ever he return to his right wits, he will begin thus rather to argue with himself: If God hath chosen me to be a Saint in heaven, and doth intend to bring me to glory; then I must out of all doubt believe, and repent, and amend my ways, and continue in Gods holy laws to my lives end, knowing that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. And although the book of election be now closed up, and a seal set upon it; yet there is an inscription upon that seal, which I can easily see and read, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* But if God doth intend to condemn me to Death eternal, it will be for my wickedness, and for my rebellion, and for being so graceless as to argue thus scornfully against Gods mercie, and the dutie that I ow to him. I will therefore with my utmost diligence apply my self to the faith and fear of his most sacred name, and take heed while I live of such desperate and blasphemous thoughts, knowing

ing they proceed from none but the Devil, who out of his endless malice to God, and envie towards me, would perswade me to be a more sot in things concerning life eternal, than he dareth to perswade me to be, in matters of this life and bodily health: For if I knew assuredly, that God did now purpose to prolong my life, to such a term of years, it were too gross a temptation to be put upon me, to make me beleeve, that it were well done of me, henceforth to cast off all care of providing food and raiment, and avoiding deadly dangers; and not to call for a boat when I am to pass over the water; and when I go into the field to battel, to leave my armour behinde me. In those things therefore that far more nearly concern me, I will never be so vile an hypocrite, or in effect, so forlorn an atheist, as to discourage and conclude in such a sort upon supposal of Gods foreknowledge and determination, whatsoever some have told me, I may do.



## CHAP. XIII.

*Whether all in Adam be pardoned.*

**T**HE Doctrine maintained by you in this chapter, is; That although all sins whatsoever springing from the sin of Adam be forgiven as of due debt, through Gods mercie, and the sacrifice of his



his Son; Nevertheless, by the *manifestation* of this his Death and Sacrifice, and by occasion of this his goodness made known to men, all their actual sins become new debts, because they are done against Gods Grace and Truth shining upon all men. In defence and explication of this detestable Doctrine. You afford us a twofold distinction: the first is this, Each " sinning as doth arise from force of natural corruption, is not charged upon men, but onely sinning voluntarily and unnecessitatedly against the Truth striving to reclaim them, pag. 63. The second distinction is so fine, and of so great subtilty, that it flies quite away from all good sense. You distinguish of sins considered before, or without Christs coming, from sins considered *as* before, or without his coming, and you ask pag. 68. if I cannot so abstract, as to consider them, as in the root, and according to what they had onely by virtue of that from what they are as against Grace vouchsafed. ]

But what say you in the mean time to those sins, that are both natural, or in some sort necessitated by corruption of nature, and voluntarie too, as many sins, if not the greatest part of them, are? Shall they be forgiven as natural, and punished as voluntary? Consider sins as before, or without Christs coming: they would yet have been against light, the light of nature: and should not they have been charged upon any man, because they were not against the light of grace, or the Gospel? And know

know you not, that to love darkness more than light, resisting of the truth, and hatred to be reformed, and offending against mercy and goodness are all of them as necessarily derived from the root you speak of, and are as truly parts and products of our hereditary pravity, as any sins are whatsoever you can name?

The chief place of Scripture you alledge, is *John* 15. 22, 24. "If I had not come; they had not had *sin*, it had not been charged upon them ] You make a twofold coming of Christ, of this sort: One as he came spiritually in his light and truth into the world in all ages, upon the account of his death undertaken, pag. 65. the second, when he came in mans nature to suffer that death. It is to your purpose that you should mean the first. But that cannot be meant, because it is said, If I had not come and spoken: and, If I had not come and done the works that none ever did: of his second coming therefore it must be meant. Now let me ask, Had Christs capital enemies no sins to be charged upon them before Christ came, or unless he had come? You have had some dealing with the people called the *Quakers*: Did ever any of them take a text of Scripture more crudely than you do this? Was there no guilt of sin laid to the Nation, upon killing of the Prophets or messengers sent beforehand, till the Son himself came? Doubtless there was a stock of sin charged upon them before, though now it came to be completed, and filled up in  
mea

measure. It is wonder you would not compare this with other places, which might soon have shewed you how foul your error was. Or why would you not view the context, or that which went before? v. 20. If they have persecuted me; and v. 24. You have both seen and hated me. It was the kinde of sin; Persecution and hatred: and it was the degree of the sin, it was hatred without a cause: it was malice against cause to the contrary; against so many good deeds, convincing and obliging. That was the sin which they had not been guilty of, if Christ had not come.

You bring another text, *Seēt.* the last, out of *Rom. 5. 14.* where you say the Apostle implies a distinction answerable to what you make. Some sins are after the similitude of *Adams* transgression, namely, "against light, knowledge, and engagement, or with free unnecessitated consent: Other sins are not so. Now man being fallen and restored again, sinneth as *Adam* did upon a new engagement by Christs death against Gods goodness, and some libertie brought into their wills."] *Ans.* *Adams* sin was against a positive and expresse law: others, till *Moses* came, sinned against the law of nature written in their hearts. The Apostle speaks nothing of light, nor of libertie, nor engagement; and dare you set on foot such a pestiferous opinion as you do, because the Apostle implies something answerable, which yet he doth not? Where doth he so much as obscure-

ly or implicitly teach, that all men from the beginning were brought to a new engagement, new light, and new libertie in their wills? Or where doth he say, that some sins are forgiven of due debt, and some not but upon Repentance?

Your discourse in the other *Sections* is so frivolous, that I must not bestow much time upon it. I will consider that place which you bring in your 10. *Section*, the which ( as it seemeth ) you esteem alone sufficient to uphold the Universalists cause, and to prove the necessitie of teaching their doctrine, as without which there is no hope of any good to be done upon any man in the world by preaching of the Gospel. The words are, 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. *The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, should not live unto themselves, but unto him.* But I suppose you would not have spent so great a part of the fourth chapter of your *Essayes*, in your boisterous and uncharitable deductions from that place, if you had bestowed a little time rightly to understand it. Be pleased therefore calmly to take notice: *First*, that the Redemption there spoken of, is not that universal Redemption which you so much insist upon, but that which is efficacious and actually applied, so that a Christian thereby is regenerated, justified, and sanctified; and, Those for whom Christ is said to have died, had been dead, and were now alive; and ought therefore in all good reason,

not to live to themselves, but to him that died for them. The like exhortation and upon the same ground, we finde *Rom.* 14. 9. Christ died that he might be the Lord of the living, and that they might live to him: and *1 Pet.* 4. 1, 2. forasmuch as Christ hath suffered for us, let us cease from sin, and live the rest of our time to the will of God. And if it be such a Redemption as is actually salutarious, and bringeth with it a new life; and if it be such a Redemption of which Sanctification is a consequent, as clearly it is by the Apostles discourse, and by parallel places, then it cannot be that which is called Universal. This is further confirmed, because

*Secondly*, The love of Christ there spoken of, is not in probabilitie to be taken actively, for that love wherewithall Christ loveth us; but passively, for that whereby we love Christ. To this sense the scope of his words there do best sute, as even they seem to acknowledge who interpret it otherwise. He would not have them to imagine, that what he spake of the Dignitie of his Ministerie, tended to his own commendation, or that such carnal end or designe had any place in him: If we be besides our selves, as you may think we are, it is for Gods sake, whom we seek and serve: The love we bear to him compelleth us to do what we do, whom alone we desire to know, and no man else, and nothing else. And if it be the love active that is there spoken of ( for I will not much contend with you

about it) then we are to know there is a twofold love that God beareth to man (as well as a twofold Redemption) A general love spoken of *Joh. 6.* *So God loved the world:* and a particular or special love, most commonly understood where his love is spoken of. *Rom. 5. 8, 9.* Love to the justified, and those that shall be saved. *1 Joh. 4. 19.* Love that causeth us to love him again: we loved him because he first loved us: & such must that love be that *constraineth*, and that causeth extasie, that setteth us as it were besides our selves: and is not likely to be that which is born towards all mankind, whatsoever in right reason it ought to be.

And *thirdly*, whereas you say that the Apostles were carried out to all their service for Christ, because of the love he bare to all men, as if they would not have been half so zealous in preaching the Gospel to all men, if they had not thought all men had been alike chosen without difference, and no man had been denied the gift of Faith; it is a very weak phansie of yours. What they did, was principally done for the elect people of God: for his Bodies sake which is the Church, *Col. 2. 24.* for the Elects sake, *2 Tim. 2. 10.* As for the rest, they knew and testified, and held themselves contented, that they were unto God a sweet savour even of death unto death, in them that perish. The love they bare to Christ, did carrie them on to do the work appointed them, leaving unto God the success of their work, and unto his secret counsels: and though

though they might labour in vain, and spend their strength for nought, yet were they well assured that their judgement was with the Lord, and their work with their God.

*Fourthly*, suppose that not onely Ministers and Preachers of the word did beleeve it, but they could moreover make all their hearers beleeve it firmly, that Christ died for all without any difference, and loved them all, not preferring one before another, would it work much upon the disobedient? I think not. If you go about to wash a raw brick, you do nought but turn it all to mire; tell an obstinate and hardened sinner of mercie that is in store for him, and the Gospel and blood of Christ, he will but turn this grace into wantonness, and be so much the more dissolute. You think all the world might be brought home to God by preaching his love to them, and telling men of his goodness and kindness to sinners. But have you never known many undutifull children, who have yet been tenderly beloved of their parents, and have known so much too? *Absolom* was not ignorant how dearly his Father affected him, and desired his good above any thing, yet still he continued an ungracious rebell. And what if he had made him partaker, yea wholly possessor of his Kingdome & Government in his life time? The Chronicles of after Ages have recorded what have come to pass in like case, and may teach us to conjecture, whether that would have brought him to any further sense of his

dutie; who knows not how little good is done by doing good to ill natures? Kindness will never alter kinde; nor will an ill-disposed man be gained to the friendship of another, whom he hates through a natural antipathy, by courtesies, and entreaties, and significations of good will towards him. Every mans experience can witness so much, and how little policie it is to heap benefits upon the ungratefull, out of hope to win them. *Fit deterior qui accipit*, saith *Cicero*, Men are the worse for endearments and obligations: Understand it of those that are bad and ill-affected of themselves, or to such an one. But so are all men naturally to the most righteous God: and it is not common kindness, nor ordinarie knowledge of his love, that will reclaim them.

*Lastly*, It may reasonably be demanded of you, how it comes to pass that this general love of God towards men, should do so much with them, and prevail so far with them; and yet his special love should do so little; yea, should rather be prejudicial to holiness. So those of your partie use to crie out, that absolute election, special and eternal love, do cause men to cast off all care of their salvation, and of walking in the way that leadeth to life, and do serve onely to make men proud and haughtie. And in your *Funeral Sermon*, 1648. "The *Pharisee*, say you, thought he could not have been so good as he was, if God had not had special and eternal love and favour towards him,] But

vill



will not a special love, and that considered comparatively too, do as much as the general love? it enflamed *Dauids* zeal, that he was chosen and preferred before *Saul*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 21. And arguments are often brought to move the Israelites to obedience, from the favour and good will that God did bear towards them, more then towards any other nation. He that beleeveth the special love, beleeveth the general also, and receiveth as much benefit from the appearance of Gods love declared in the Gospel, as any others do: for what is there that should any way hinder them?

---

Now because you think that you must maintain, some sins are forgiven absolutely, *as of due debt*, because otherwise universal Redemption, presupposeth two payments of the same debt, one from the Saviour of the world, another from the person impenitent or unbelieving, pag. 61. "*It is unjust to require two payments of the same debt.*" ] I desire your attention to what I shall now say. The work of the Son of God in behalf of lost mankind is set forth to us diversly; under the term and likeness of Reconciliation, or Atonement of parties that are at distance: of a Sacrifice offered to propitiate the Deitie: of Adoption, whereby not onely pardon for malefactours, but further, the state of sons and heirs is procured: of Redemption, whereby captives are ransomed by some price paid:

of one that is punished in anothers stead, or for anothers fault, or that doth satisfie or discharge the debt, which some other oweth. These particulars, with divers others, being of a different nature one from another, cannot all of them, perfectly agree to the work of mans salvation, that Jesus Christ wrought. With men ordinarily, there is a numerical punishment, applyed to a numerical or individual fault. But when Christ was smitten for our sins, the punishment was one, but of infinite value, applicable to the sins of all men, were there more than there are, or ever will be. In this similitude therefore, the respect of *punishing the same fault twice*, must be forborn: so must that also, touching a *double payment of the same debt*. But take the other similitudes; Reconciliation there may be, and Adoption there may be, which may come to nothing for want of the condition: and a general ransom may be many ways defective, as to some persons: and a Sacrifice may be offered, and the God not appeased; according as the Latines make a difference betwixt *Sacrificare* and *Litare*: to your argument therefore I answer, when the payment or satisfaction is absolute, as to all effects, then there is no other satisfaction to be expected.

But when it is absolute as to some effect, and conditional, as to some other; then it is neither against reason, nor justice, nor custome, but that a payment, pardon or satisfaction may be twofold. The General ransome is absolute thus far, that Gods justice

Justice or wrath is appeasable. All sins are venial, and way made for pardon, the Covenant of works notwithstanding. But thus far it is conditional, that shall not be actually beneficial for any to life eternal; but according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace, namely, upon Repentance and Belief in the Son of God. I gave you the similitude of a general pardon granted from the King: to which you say not one word to the purpose, but most impertinently betake your self to the point of Free-will, in the fourth *Section* of your former chapter. And as for the injustice you speak of, I answer, had we our selves of our own, paid these our debts: or had our Suretie and Redeemer paid them and satisfied for them so, as that all men should by vertue of his sacrifice have been instantly discharged from all their sins, and admitted to possession of life, no condition whatsoever intervening: or had Almighty God made any such promise or agreement, with his son our Saviour, to bestow faith and repentance upon all those, for whom he was to lay down his life: in any of these cases, it had not been just to demand a second payment. But inasmuch as God himself did freely procure the ranfome and satisfaction for our sins; It was free for him to annex hereto, what conditions it pleased him. There is therefore no wrong done to such persons as are punished for their sins, after the price of their ranfome is accepted, because they did neither pay that ranfome, nor perform the condition required.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XIV.

*Election, what it is.*

*Sect. 1. & 2.* **Y**OU needed not to have troubled your self, to finde out some that have spoken as you did. I implied so much, and yet thought *you* blameworthy, not them; because you were busied about an ill work. Moreover, Of all things, *Definitions* ought to be deliberate and well weighed, and it is one thing how some learned writers may chance sometime to speak, while they are discoursing before grown and well grounded Christians; another thing what words you use in delivering the first principles to new beginners: who if they be not instituted very warily may fall into some heresie, the name whereof they never yet heard. For as that which deceived *Nestorius*, was the want of good attending and taking heed to the first beginning of the union or combination between God and man; so likewise to treat of the Incarnation, in such a manner that children may think there are not onely two Natures in Christ, but two Persons, may breed in them the same opinion that *Nestorius* held.

*Señ. 3.* "It is *Beza's* one of his own Masters; from him I received the notion, and gave both terms, chose or purposed to choose. ]

When two several men shall do, or shall say the very same thing, it comes to be quite another thing.

His *Eligit*, and *Decrevit eligere*, differ not much. But they are not all one with yours: if your Doctrine and Definition of Election, be the same with his; then may his authoritie make for you: his meaning is, that from eternitie he purposed to choose us when we should come to be fallen in Adam, and not when we come indeed to beleieve: or howsoever it be, he seemeth to take Election there for a transient action, whereas others take it for an immanent. You might take the term from *Beza*, but the sense you had from your other Masters. And who was their Master? *Socinus* Prelect. 13. pag. 63. *Eligendi verbum declarat eligendi decretum. Paulus affirmare non dubitat Deum suos jam glorificasse.* Here you have your Doctrine and your proof too. How you make it good, that none are said to be Elected before they be called, falleth to the Readers share to consider, and to see what regard you give to testimonies of Scripture.

---

" That the Elect signifie, not *chosen*, but  
 " choice, I know not who says. ]

The

The evasion is so common, to make Elect and Reprobate to be Adjectives and not Participles, and to denote a Qualitie in man, no Act in God, that it is much you have not taken notice of it. I will now name one of your Masters, whom you divers times have alledged here: *Hemingius de Grat. univ. pag. 25. Primo hoc tenendum est quod Electus non sit Participium, ut quidam falsò putant, sed nomen habitus seu formæ hærentis in anima hominis credentis.* But though I have helped you to the notion, yet that you may not think it worth your taking notice of, to your purpose, I pray observe that in all reason, *Elegit nos*, containeth *nos electos*, if he chose us, we are chosen. and 1 Pet. 2. 4. Disallowed of men, à *Deo autem electum*, but chosen of God, it must needs have the force of a Participle; and though it be but an Adjective verbal, yet hath it the signification passive, as *κλῆντις*. which I hope they will give us leave, to render by a Participle, called until they can tell us how we may render it otherwise. But were it but a Substantive, it were sufficient to make good the Doctrine, that you oppose *Rom. 11. 7. Electio consecuta est*: the Election hath obtained. The rest were hardened: where, as I think you must interpret, *the election*, by *the elected*, by virtue of the opposition to *ceteri*, *the rest*, in the other member of the verse. Another of your Masters *Huberus*, a down-right Universalist, howsoever he seems to overlook all inferiour learning and cries out upon *Grammaticuli & Discipuli Libanii*, &

*Lyana Grammatica*; is yet content to stoop to so  
 low game, as to tell us, that *eligere*, in the Etymo-  
 logie of it, is *extrahere ex miseria omne humanum ge-*  
*neris*: not to choose, but onely to take out, or draw  
 out. Thus you may say that *Feremie* was elected  
 out of the Dungeon, and *Ioseph* cut of the pit, as  
 the Midjanites passed by. I think it was wisely  
 done of him, that drove away all the true birds out  
 of sight, when he had a minde to set forth, and to  
 commend his deformed counterfeits. And here pre-  
 sently you observe the Grammatical case, to prove  
 that God chooseth men when they beleeve. *1 Pet.*  
*1.* chosen *in* the sanctification of Spirit: and yet  
 you cannot but know that those who have very  
 good skill in the Greek, turn it, *to sanctification*;  
 others *into*, or *unto* sanctification. You may com-  
 pare it with *Ephes. 1.4.* he hath chosen us that we  
 should be holy, or to be holy: not, *being holy*, or  
 because we were holy: And inasmuch as *S. Peter*  
 whose words mentioneth all the persons in the  
 Unitie, ascribing Election to God the Father, Re-  
 demption to the Son, and Sanctification to the ho-  
 ly Ghost, it is best to understand these three works  
 together, and not to make Election and Sanctification  
 one, as you would do.

Here be three things further to be considered in  
 this chapter.

1. Whether our Saviour Christ be chosen first.
2. Whether he be chosen to salvation.
3. Whether he alone be personally chosen.

To

To the *first* of these, your words are *sect. 4.* H  
 “ faults me for beginning with Christ in the Do  
 “ ctine of Election; a great offence to them tha  
 “ lay him by therein, and give him not the Preemi  
 “ nence in all things; could not he see that to b  
 “ the Apostles method, *he chose us in him*, then not  
 “ but with respect to him, as his chosen ones, see  
 “ ing we receive from him and his fulness, and  
 “ grace for grace. ]

Untill you be able to shew, out of the very words  
 of the pretended Orthodox, not out of *Tilenus* and  
*Arcana Dogmatum*, that they lay aside Christ in the  
 Doctrine of Election, you must give me leave to  
 think that these words are a great slander: and  
 withall, a great argument, that neither you nor  
 yours are able to speak any thing, against your ad  
 versaries opinion, because you will not represent  
 as it is, but must alter it, and pervert it, and make  
 quite another thing, before you dare to meddle with  
 it. For their constant Doctrine is, That the Decree  
 of Election to life doth include the means by which  
 it is brought to pass; the first and chief whereof,  
*Christ Jesus* the Redeemer. And although the end  
 and the means towards it, be thought upon toge  
 ther by every wise agent at the same time, yet the  
 intention of the end, doth precede the means, in  
 nature, or as others call it, in *signo rationis*, in reason  
 because the end propounded, is the true Reason  
 and the true Cause, why the Means are such as the  
 are. When you described Election, to be the choi



the man *Christ*, to be united with the Word, I told you it was an innovation, and I should think it so, till I knew some one or other that herein went before you. In stead of naming any such, you tell me of some, that lay aside *Christ* in the doctrine of election. I send you now a kinde of second challenge, to name them that do so: and now if you can, you may answer both the challenges together.

“ But then, say you, Christ should not have the preeminence in all things. ] To this I answer, that our Saviour Christ is not now in this inquirie, to be considered absolutely as the second person of the Trinitie, coequal with the Father, God blessed forever: But as he was incarnate, and did take upon him mans nature in the fulness of time, and suffered. As he is the most high God and Creatour of us and all things, so we and all things are for him, *Caloss. 1. 16.* yet though all things were made by him, and for him; nevertheless, as it is in the *Nice Creed*, *For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven, and was incarnate.* His incarnation was for the sake of his Passion: therefore did he take upon him our flesh, that he might be capable of so mean an office, as to die for us, *Hebr. 2. 14.* And can you think that both these, his Incarnation and his Passion, with other parts of his mediation, were in nature or reason first thought upon, as being the end why the Church was? If our Saviour Christ must have the preeminence in all things, as you mean, even of Gods purpose in sending him, then

then man was to be saved that Christ might come. The Son of God is rightly preferred before us and all creatures: yet is not every thing that he did, or suffered, so far to be preferred before mans benefit but that mans salvation, may as the end be preferred in the reason or order of causalitie, before that action or passion of his. He was foreordained of God for our Redemption, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. And he is to be considered as the instrumental cause by which we are brought to life, as the chosen servant of God by whom his will and pleasure doth prosper and take effect, *Isa.* 53. v. 10, 11. You seem to fear that inasimuch as the end is more honourable and valuable than the means, if *we* be the end why *Christ* was chosen to be Gods servant, then *we* should be more honourable than *Christ* is. But you are mistaken; for that rule doth hold onely in those means, which having no absolute goodness or worth of their own, are onely valuable by that relation which they bear unto their ends: otherwise it holdeth not: for the Angels are more worthy and honourable then men, yet are sent forth as ministering spirits for the good of men. The Angels are superiour to men, yet may mans benefit be above, and preferred before some actions ministeriall of the Angels. The King may condescend to do some action for his meanest subject; yea to signe a pardon for a rebellious subject, or a traytour; in which case he valueth the life of his subject before the setting to his own hand or seal, otherwise he would not do it.

it: And yet, I hope, the King hath still the preeminence in all things.

There is no just cause of your distast in this matter, nor of any mans dissent, if it be well considered, how they who teach, that the end or fruit of Christs Incarnation, is the salvation of Gods elect, not onely in general but in particular; for whose respect and benefit it was that Christ was sent; do withall readily acknowledge, that the end or fruit of mans salvation is, that Christ may have the honour of it, and that it may be as the Apostle saith, *Eph. 1. 12. To the praise of his glory.* So that our Saviour is no way disparaged or undervalued, but still and ever, Of him, and To him are all things.

Many of them who seem to honour Christ more than others do, in beginning with him, and making him the foundation of election, do indeed most dishonour him; for they make him a foundation possibly without any building upon it: a head, possibly without any bodie: a King without any subjects. For while we suppose all means necessarie to salvation afforded to all men, it may be according to what they teach, that not one shall beleeve, or if he do, he may fall away.

While you tell us, That Christ having the preeminence in all things, is worthy to have it in election too, page 71. I pray take heed lest it be intended *you* that would have the preeminence, and that while you seem to honour Christ, you do not intend honour your self, your own power and natural

abilities. If your Adversaries doctrine prevail, then all the glorie redounds to God and his grace. But if God doth choose his Son Jesus Christ, & send him into the world, and then chooseth all those that beleeve in him, ( if any there be that will beleeve in him, for all may if they will ) then if you be chosen, it is because you beleeve: you are worthy and fit to be chosen, because you are in Christ, and then you may thank your self, and not say with the *Pharisee*, one of the *pretended Orthodox*, God I thank thee, I am not as other men are.

“ If he chose us in him, then not but  
“ with respect to him.

It is granted [ not without respect to him ] if you mean not without respect had to Christs Passion, by which our Redemption is wrought, and our election is completed in the execution of it. But it is denied if you mean thus: not without respect to him as the cause why we were elected. For though the means be the cause of producing the effect; yet are they not the cause why the effect is determined, and resolved upon to be produced. For example: God destinated food and medicine to be the means to maintain mans corporal life and health: so that food and medicine are in some sort, the cause of mans life and health, yet are they not the cause why God was moved to give to man life and health.

Page 74. " The election of his Church (well-  
 " said, that's not of uncalled.)

They may be the Church of God in his counsel of election, before they be his called and gathered Church. *Matth. 1. 21. He shall save his people from their sins. Ephes. 5. 25. Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie it.* Christ had his people as yet uncalled, and a Church as yet un sanctified.

I named two places to prove that the love of God did precede the sending, or purpose of sending his Son. The first, *So God loved the world, that he gave his Son*: the other, *God loved us and sent his Son*. To this you say, " The Church and the  
 " world are not all one; and are resolved not to pity  
 " me, because I am not humble, but to laugh at me  
 " that I may be ashamed.] It shall not trouble me  
 which of the two liketh you best, either the one or the other: or you may, if it please you, forbear both the one and the other, and be sober. I named two places, the latter of them you wholly omitted, for had you mentioned that, there had been no colour for your vain and swelling words, for it is plain by the Apostles discourse, *1 Joh. 4.* when he said *he loved us*, he meant not the world but the Church. And the former place of the two I explicated, to prevent all cavil, if it might have been, in these words, [*Whether it were Gods love to mankind in the general, or in special to the elect, his love doth go before his purpose to send his Son,*] where you could

not but see, that I foresaw what might be objected from the ambiguitie and different acception of the word *world*: for take it how you will, my argument held firm to my purpose; and the second place is without exception.

Page 75. “ *Zanchy* another of his own  
 “ partie will condemn him, for making election before the purpose of sending Christ.]

Against his authoritie I set *Peter Martyrs*, Loc. Com. pag. 457. *Christus primum & precipuum Prædestinationis effectum est.* D. *Prideaux Fascic.* pag. 138. *Includitur Christus ut Caput mediorum in exequendo.* *Wollebius, Chr. Th.* 1. 4. *Christus ut Mediator, est electionis exequenda medianm.* *Alvarez De Incarn. verb. Div.* pag. 451 *In genere causa objectiva, prius nostro modo intelligendi voluit Deus salvare homines, quam mittere salvatorem, quia Incarnatio verbi fuit volita in remedium peccati.* *Bannes tom.* 1. pag. 297. *Unio hypostatica est effectus prædestinationis totius corporis mystici.* That is, That God did send his Son into the world, did proceed from divine predestination, as the chief part of the means to accomplish it.

Pag. 75. “ That the Apostle calleth  
 “ election the foundation of God, 2 *Tim.*

“ 2. 19. is one of the Elders traditions: it’s  
 “ but a private interpretation so to take it,  
 “ no other Scripture says it : but to say,  
 Christ is the foundation, as laid in the Apo-  
 “ stles doctrine, which is not shaken by  
 “ mans falling off, is more agreeable to Scri-  
 “ ture, and to the Apostles scope in that  
 place.]

It is the Tradition of your Elders also. *Hagu-Remonstrants*, pag. 112. Edit. Bert. *Fundamentum Electionis. Est.* They did grant, that the foundation there spoken of, is Election. So in this, as in many other things you have outgone your masters. See that it be for the better: for some wax worse, as you are admonished a little before at the 16 verse of that chapter, and at the 13 verse of the next.

You go on resolutely, and say, It is but a *private interpretation*. But what mean you when you say for a private interpretation in the place of *S. Peter*, is *propria expositio*, a mans own interpretation, as the word is taken elsewhere, as *Acts* 1. 25. Judas went to his *own place*: and *Jude* v. 6. the angels left their *own habitation*. And when you say, Christ is the foundation, that is indeed *your own* interpretation: for it is no mans else that I know. Those *Seſtaries* who would annul all duties, upon pretence to magnifie Christ and his grace, are wont to say, that the New Creature, and the New man, are to be meant of Christ: and by Love, *1 Cor.* 13. and the armour

mentioned *Ephes. 6.* Christ is meant: and good works, say they, are not as they are commonly thought to be, *the way* to glory, because Christ is the way. And as you may remember, in one of your published discourses, to that text of *Psal. 119. Blessed are the undefiled in the way*, alledged to prove perfection in this life, you give this answer [Christ is the way: we grant some undefiled and complete in Christ] Thus your *Antinomian* spots do now and then break out, and appear, though you be angry to hear of it: and thus you may think to honour Christ, while you wrest and abuse his word, and may seem to be zealous for him, but your zeal is not according to knowledge. It is true that Christ is, and is called a foundation: yet is he not everie foundation that any where is spoken of. Christ is the Resurrection, is there therefore no other resurrection? neither is it true that no other Scripture says it. There be divers other places that say in effect, that Gods election is a firm foundation against falling away, and being seduced: *Matth. 24. If it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Rom. 9. 11. That the purpose of God according to election might stand. The election have obtained, but the rest were hardened, Rom. 11.* His meaning is, the elect have obtained; but he saith, the election, to intimate that they obtained, *non quâ fideles*, not as faithfull, nor in any other regard; but the ground-work or foundation of final perseverance was *election*. But you hardened your forehead too much when you wrote thus,



thus, That your exposition is most agreeable to the Apostles scope in that place: for his scope is clearly this, Though some eminent professors be fallen away, and others be gone after them, yet let not this shake your confidence that are true beleivers, because your safetie and preservation is laid upon a firm foundation, even Gods eternal purpose, which maketh the difference betwixt you and them. This I will evince to be the Apostles intent, 1, by that word *Nevertheless*: which word is manifestly exceptive, exempting some from falling away, even those that are his: 2, by a parallel place, which you cannot so easily shift off: 2 *Thess.* 2. having set forth the marvellous prevalence of Antichristian seducers, and the fearfull estate of those that were seduced; for the comfort of Gods people he doth ground the difference of them from the Apostates, upon the foundation of Gods election, v. 13. But we are bound to give thanks to God alway for you brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth. If God chooseth, and calleth, and justifieth, and glorifieth, who can be against us? what shall separate us from him? But when Christians shall be struck with the fear of a spreading Apostasie, and begin to think with themselves thus: This defection thus encreasing may go on, and swallow us up also; It is no manner of relief or satisfaction, to say; Though we and all men fall away,

and be given over to be deceived, and to beleieve lies; yet Jesus Christ the Son of God continueth the treasure of all his blessings: a sure foundation to them that beleieve in him, he abideth firm as a rock, though we and all men that now cleave to him, come to suffer shipwrack one after another. Therefore that is no way likely to be the scope of the place.

*Next* is to be considered, whether our Saviour Jesus Christ be chosen to salvation. In the funeral sermon upon which you wrote your exercitations, & called them Essays, when you met with that saying, [ That there should be any one chosen, was the infinite free mercy of God in Christ ] you would scarce admit it to pass under your approbation, unless with this your interpretation [ It was Gods infinite mercie to choose and save one man even the man Christ Jesus ] which proposition of yours, howsoever you may please your self therein, hath little salt or savour in it. For then is God mercifull when he helpeth his creatures out of miserie. To save, and mercie in saving, these terms, in all reason suppose a lost estate. It was infinite mercie in God to send a Saviour: but to save a Saviour, comes too near the scoff of the Jews. *If thou be the king of Israel, save thy self.* There is little hope of him being a Saviour that standeth in need himself to be saved. What they said had thus much of truth in it, He who needed a Saviour, was not likely to save others. Howbeit that Death from which they would

would have him save himself, was the means to save us.

“ Was not Christ chosen to life and salvation, as man? could any part of the seed of David or Abraham, have escaped death, or been glorified in life, had it not been chosen of God thereto, and that by Christs dying? ]

Here you implice and teach plainly enough, that Christ by his own dying escaped death, and attained the life of glory: and that he came to save himself as well as others. And this were not so ill as it is, if want of sense were the worst. For death being the stipend of sin, if Jesus Christ had need, by reason of the common law and manner of men, to save himself from Death; then how could he be our high Priest, holy and undefiled, and separate from sinners, and a spotless sacrifice offered on our behalf?

There is no Christian that hath learned his Creed, and been well instructed in those words of the third Article [ *conceived by the holy Ghost* ] but must needs take check at what you have here written. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh. The imputation, and the pollution of Adams sin, are conveyed to all his posteritie, by natural or carnal generation. But *Jesus Christ*, as man, was conceived  
*superna-*

*supernaturally*: and that stream or flux of original sin, which universally and uninterruptedly descended upon mankind from the first Adam; was cut off and stopped by the miraculous work of the holy Ghost, so that Christs humane nature was not defiled thereby, but was preserved free from all taint and touch of the flesh, or sinfull corruption. And because as he was man, he had no father, therefore is he said to be *FACTUS Rom. 1. 3.* and *Gal. 4. 4.* not *Genitus*, not begotten but made, *made of a woman*, or, of the substance of his mother: and because he was so, and that by the holy Ghost, *Ideoque nascetur, sanctum: Luke 1. 35.* Therefore that which was born of her, was holy, perfectly exempted from sin, and the guilt of sin, otherwise than as he took upon him the sin and guilt of others.

You quote two places for your purpose, *Zach. 9. 9.* Thy king cometh having salvation, or, saving himself: you choose to take it passively, with the *Jews* who take occasion hence to calumniate; rather than actively, with the most and best interpreters. Christ was called *Jesus*, because he saved his people, not because he was saved: or if it be said, that he saved himself, it was that he might not be swallowed up of Death after his passion. The other text is *Hebr. 5. 7.* He offered prayers to him that was able to save him from Death and was heard: this is spoken of bodily Death, which our Saviour did in some sort, for a time, shrink from, praying that the cup might pass from him: and he was saved from

from Death, so as that he triumphed over Death: or if you understand it of his prayer upon the cross, what is that to salvation from Death eternal, and the wrath of God in the world to come? which salvation we stood in need of, but he needed not.

*Lastly*, We are to consider whether onely Christ, and none else, be personally chosen. Now although this be your Doctrine plainly, yet you will not allow me to gather it out of the Answer in your *Catechisme*: which in effect, and in brief was this. *Election is that whereby God did choose Jesus Christ to be united to the Godhead, and all that beleeve in him, to blessing.* Here I observed thus. All in general, none in particular, not any determinately. Hereunto you make answer, "I thought the general had included the particulars, not excluded them. I am sure in stead of having new Doctrines, he hath new Logick. All in general, therefore none in particular.]

I answer first; A General doth include every particular: but All *in* general, doth not include any one particular. And secondly, the Generals, wherever they are, include the particulars, but where the generals are onely upon supposition, it is possible the particulars may have no positive being. Whosoever doth perfectly keep the law of God, shall be saved. This proposition is true in the general: yet in particular no one person in the world shall be saved by keeping the law of God. So when it is said, *Whosoever beleeveth shall be saved*, this being the

the Election which you teach; there may in the event be some particular person saved, but as to the *choice*, no one particular person is chosen before another, because they are all without any difference beforehand. Neither said I, All in general, *Therefore* none in particular. It should be supplied thus, *nevertheless* none in particular, and I have told you who of your own partie held, that though salvation be intended to all, yet possibly to none particular it may befall. And let me tell you now, what you heard not yet from me, that the second part of the Definition that you give of Election, is a mock-answer as well as the first. For as the first part is, of the union of the two natures in one person, that is, the *Incarnation*; So the second is, concerning the *Gospel*, but not at all, concerning Election. For what is the Gospel? *He that beleeveth shall be saved*. Mark 16. 16. The preaching of Christ crucified to save them that beleeve. 1 Cor. 1. 21. And this is that very thing which you in words metaphorical, others of your partie in words more proper, do call Election; both removing the old terms, bounds and words; faulting modern systemes, to make way for new-coined opinions.

The Gospel proffers life upon condition of beleeving: As the Law did upon condition of working: Gods purpose of Election, 1. ordaineth life eternal absolutely, not whether we beleeve, or no, as is constantly, and as I think unconscionably by some objected; but without any such conditional

proviso

proviso of beleeving, because 2. it ordaineth  
 both and all other means infallibly conducing to  
 eternal life. So there is difference enough between  
 the Doctrine of the Gospel, and the Decree of E-  
 lection ( though they be made all one by them that  
 lay the grounds of the study in Divinitie in the mo-  
 dern *systome* of the *Racovian Catechisme*, as may be  
 seen there in pag. 231. ) but in doing so, they at-  
 tempt to break open the seal which the Apostle  
 speaks of, *2 Tim. 2.* and to publish all that is con-  
 tained and concealed under it, Even this, *All men*  
*that beleeve, shall be saved.* But enough hath been  
 said of this chapter.



## CHAP. XV.

### *Election in beleeving.*

*Pag. 79.* You interpret those words of the  
 Apostle, *2 Thess. 2. 13.* from the beginning,  
 “ thus; from the beginning of the Gospel  
 “ preaching amongst them, like as the same  
 “ phrase is used. *1 Joh. 2. 24.* let that abide  
 “ in you which you have heard from the be-  
 “ ginning. ]

But I pray you, are these parallel places? If you  
 did intend to gather the meaning of the Scripture,  
 by

by conferring one place with another, why did you not confer this with *Ephes. 1.4.* he hath chosen us before the foundation of the world? you should compare places that are alike, and speak of the same thing, as these two do, and not finde out place where the same word is used of quite another matter. Or did the Apostle intend to free from the danger of defection, those that beleaved at the first hearing, more than those that beleaved a while after? To be chosen out of the world, I said, is Vocation, not Election.

“ This you say, is a sorry shift. Election, is not so large as Vocation, for many be the called, few the chosen. ]

You will not rightly deliver the grounds of Divinitie, if you cannot distinguish betwixt Vocation external & Vocation internal. Of the former it is said, Many are the called, few the chosen. Of the other, the Apostle speaketh to this effect, *Rom. 8.* All that are called, were elected, are justified, and shall be glorified.

---

“ He saith, *The Lord hath chosen him that is godly*, is to be understood of choice to office, that is, the kingdome, *Psal. 4. 3.*  
 “ a piteous evasion. Chooses he godly men always to be kings?

But the Psalmist speaks but singularly, so that you



you need not to extend it to all godly men. In behalf of the exposition which I gave, I have this authority. *Grotius, Sanctum suum, id est, unctum. Tremellius, Ut Regem quem designavit, statuat. Lira, fecit mirabilem vocando de gregibus ad regni jura. Gnebrard, Celebrem reddidit me Davidem à se consecratum. D. Hammond, ---separated me to be his vicegerent upon earth, conferring with Psal. 78. 70. I chose David also his servant. Ainsworth, God had promised David the honour of the kingdome. Calvin, Communem sententiam sequi tutius judico, quod Deus regem elegerit.* So that it is the common exposition which I gave: so you may see how rash you are in censuring those that gave approbation to this, which you call a piteous evasion.

---

“ If in *Psal. 65. Blessed is the man whom thou chooshest*, be meant of choosing or admitting to the Church visible, then *Judas* and the *Pharisees* were blessed men.]

Yes, they were blessed after such a manner as all the members of the Church visible are blessed, *Psal. 84. 5. Blessed are they that dwell in thy house.* Yet hypocrites may dwell in Gods house. You must know therefore that *blessedness* in such like cases, doth not signifie blessedness absolute, but relative and particular: and the intent is onely to speak well of, or to commend the condition of them whom

whom we call blessed. *Blessed are thy servants that stand before thee & hear thy wisdom. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them. Blessed are the barren. Blessed art thou, O Land, when thy King is the son of Nobles.* You may finde it otherwise rendred. *Ecclus 25. Well is him that dwelleth with a wife of understanding. Well is him that speaketh in the ears of him that will hear. With whom it is well, he is called blessed.* Thus may we say that *Judes* and the *Pharisees* were blessed men, or happie men, in hearing and conversing with Jesus Christ; as *Solomons* servants were in standing before him; nor that they were absolutely blessed or happy persons. Having thus bewrayed your ignorance and vulgar conceptions unbecoming a learned man, nevertheless with these words you put an end to this chapter

- 
- “ I may conclude he hath piteously cavill’d here, and made sorrie and senseless evasions: whether out of wilfulness, or some hand of the Lord infatuating him, I know not: but me thinks that he himself, and all that read him, should be ashamed of it. I heard that a Doctour and some reverend men in C. gave approbation to this piece of his. I hope it is not so: for if it be, I greatly fear God hath infatuated the men of this generation, because of their too long and stubborn opposition

“ position of the truth, that they should  
 “ commend things so senseless.]

In your last leaf you charge my review with want of three things, Logick, Ethicks, and Theologie. Doubtless you had too little of something or other, when you wrote after this manner: for which your manner you deserve no other answer than this, *οὐδὲ γὰρ παύειν ἐνέστι ἀνεπίστος*, that so you may accompanie *Cyclops* in the den. But because you are pleased at the end, in correction of the mis-printings to take notice of an ugly parenthesis, as you call it, and to put a *deleatur* upon it, & *si quid aliud ejusdem generis inveniatur*, and upon any thing else that may be found like unto it; if you be content, we are agreed, that these lines bear that parenthesis company, and be thrust in among the *Errata* of your own, which you there distinguish from those of the press. So proceed I to that which followeth.



## CHAP. XVI.

### *Election in personal considerations.*

*Seet, 1.* “ **I**N Election to life we cannot  
 “ be considered as fallen in *Adam*, and be chosen in *Christ*, one consideration destroys the other, as he that

M

“ gives

“ gives another a cup of water as a disciple,  
 “ doth not give it him simply as to a thirsty  
 “ man, ]

You may think you have got the start of me, in crying out, *weakly, piteous, senseless*. There is no great hurt done; but who can otherwise think of this, and a great deal the like of yours, but as weak and worthless? May not a cup of cold water be given to a Christian both *because* he is thirstie and wanteth relief, and also *because* he is *Christ's* disciple, and in that regard claimeth relief? at the verie same time that he is considered as a Christian, he is also considered as thirstie, else the gift were not worth the giving. So may we be considered *as* fallen in *Adam*, and needing help; and withall *as* ordained to obtain life eternal by *Iesus Christ* our Redeemer.

In the fourth *Section*, he that is loth to read over all your book, may finde enough for a taste, how to judge of your dealing. I did say that the meaning of those words *Ephes. 1. He chose us in him*, was not that God chose Christ first, and in choosing him chose us. I proved it out of the words in the seventh verse, and the like manner of speech there, [ *in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.* ] I asked, had Christ forgiveness first, and we in him? No. Now to have forgiveness is to be forgiven. *Mark 3. 29. He that shall blaspheme against the holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness.* *Acts 10. 43.*

Whoso-

Whosoever beleeueth in him shall receive remission of sins. Redemption and forgiveness are here taken passively: as they are taken actively, so they may be said to be in Christ. I might have said thus, for so I meant: Was Christ forgiven first, and then we in him? Was Christ redeemed first, and we in him? and then I had prevented that most absurd and impertinent vagarie of yours, of partaking of a feast by coming into the house where it is, with a great deal the like, which when you wrote, I wonder where your senses were wandring. I call you back therefore, if I may, and I tell you, *We were forgiven and redeemed in Christ*; yet Christ was not forgiven and redeemed first. So were we chosen in Christ, and yet Christ was not chosen as we were chosen.

For the clearer understanding of this matter, and of those words [*We were chosen in Christ*] it is needfull to distinguish. The word [*Christ*] may be taken two ways: First, *personally*, for the Son of God made man, and suffering for us: Secondly, *collectively*, as it signifies a mystical bodie, whereof Christ is the Head; a body congregated of Christ and all beleevers incorporate with him. You take it in this latter sense, as if we were chosen because we were united to him, or after we were made one with him. But I have shewed that it is to be taken in the former sense, for the person of the Mediatour *in whom*, that is, *by whom*, *by whose blood*, v. 7. we were chosen to salvation, or to be brought to life:

as he is taken not for a person, but for a collective bodie, so indeed, not otherwise, we may be said to be chosen into him; but no way in him, as you mean.

You think, If election of the Church do in nature or reason precede the choice of a Mediatour; then we cannot be chosen in Christ, because we are chosen before the consideration of him. ] It is more irksome to speak to him that will not understand, than to him that cannot. Let me use a few words to your layman, whosoever he was that had the good hap to espie this contradiction: for this is likely to be that which you speak of in the twentieth chapter. My friend, you intend to build an house, this is your end and purpose, this you think of first; next, you think of hiring workmen, and providing materials, as means towards building the house: and yet you cannot for the least moment of time, think to build an house not having where withall; without workmen and materials. You intend to cross the haven, this is your first purpose next you think of taking boat; you think of one before the other, and yet you think of them both together. Likewise, it is but one purpose, desire or resolution of yours to make a voyage into *France*, and to go a ship-board; you intend these two both together, yet in reason the first of these first, because you desire the other onely in order to that. If neither you nor your friend can understand this, you are more fit to meddle in other

matters, than in finding out contradictions.

Your Essay, that names written in heaven should be the qualities of godly, meek, mercifull, written ever in heaven, but put upon men when they beleeve, came out of *Socinus*'s shop, as I told you some where before, though you have hammered it more then any other that I know of. "The names of beleevers are according to their frames, and you quote *Solomons Proverbs*, The wise in heart shall be called prudent.] I told you that qualities are not names: Prudent is a qualitie: so is righteous, poor in spirit, mercifull. Here you answer somewhat nicely [ "*Prudence* is the qualitie, *Prudent* the name. ] You shall not need to tell me of my new *Logick*, I have enough left of my old to tell you, that *Prudence* is a qualitie in the *Abstract*, and *Prudent* is a qualitie, no less, in the *Concrete*, so they are both qualities, but neither of them any mans name. But you, as before you confounded qualities with names, now confound Grammar with *Logick*, as if those things which differ in the one, must differ in the other also. I can discern nothing further in this Chapter, concerning which there is need of any notice to be taken, or to be given. I shall onely give you this my reason against this new *Essay*. When we read that there are in heaven names written in a book, it is borrowed from mens custome, who are wont to set down in writing the names of certain persons in a book, scrol, or catalogue, to the intent that their persons may be for sundry purposes, the

more certainly remembred in time to come. So that though there be no book, or writing with God, yet is there somewhat like it; and the thing itself is found among men. But as for your kinde of book or writing, a book full, not of proper names, but *Adjectives*, or *Qualities*, it is no where found, that I can tell of, neither know I where to look for it. Therefore vnless you and yours can invent this, you have invented nothing.



## CHAP. XVII.

*Jacob and Esau.*

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Pharaoh.*

**I** Dare trust any Reader with your xvii chapter throughout, if his senses be but awake, though they be not much exercised. Onely I observe what encouragement you give him at the beginning, while you explain your meaning of that in your Catechisme, [“ *The Scripture says not, that the* “ *Election of Jacob, and the rejection of Esau* “ *were personal; by personal evidently meaning as* considered in their own persons without Christ for, *First*, you then explained your self in the very next answer thus; *Not personally, but nationally*; therefore it is too bad to say that you *evidently meant* any thing else than *Nationally*. *Secondly*, though something hath been said touching election perso-



nal and withall in Christ; yet for *Eſau's* rejection, how *that* should be, not personal but in Christ, or not without him, you should have helped your Reader in this, who is not always of so quick invention as your self. As for your xviii chapter, I know nothing in it, but may receive satisfaction either from what hath formerly been said, or from what hereafter followeth.



## CHAP. XIX.

*Vessels of honour and dishonour.*

*Scēt. 1.* He saith, I interpret a vessel of  
 “ honour, upon which any honour is con-  
 “ ferred, whereas I spake onely of Divine  
 “ honour, and in things heavenly, or re-  
 “ lating thereunto. ]

And what other honour, could I mean, than Divine? yea, how could you otherwise take me, when I expressed what I meant by *any*, when I added, *though* for the duration *temporary and transitorie*, for such are all the honours which he mentioneth. ] I hope you do not take *temporarie*, for *temporal*.

That the preposition, “ *In, in honorem,*  
 “ *To honour,* doth not import a permanent  
 “ condition, you would prove from *Isai. 14.*  
 “ 2. Where people are taken *in servos &*  
 “ *in ancillas*, for servants and handmaids.  
 “ Must they therefore be ever so? may they  
 “ not be made free? ]

But 1. *In servos*, denotes a state, or condition, which is more than *aid*, or *choise means* towards an estate, as you made it. And 2. Bondage, your own instance, is a state permanent and final, during life. It is true, that a slave may be made free: it is possible, but it is accidental to slavery, not of the nature of it. And strangers were not released at the year of Jubilee, as the Hebrew bondmen were, but their bondage did abide from one generation to another.

---

“ The potter makes a vessel for honour:  
 “ that is his final end: yet it may be marred  
 “ on the wheel: and he may turn it, and  
 “ make another vessel. *Jer. 18. 3, 4.* ]

The Apostle *Rom. 9. 20, 21.* sheweth Gods absolute power to dispose of men finally as it best pleaseth him, by the likeness of a Potter, that out of the same lump of clay, frameth one vessel to honourable use, another to dishonourable: the similitude

*clay* is taken out of *Isai.* or at least, is the same  
 that the Prophet there useth, Chap. 45. v. 9. *Wo*  
*to him that striveth with his maker: shall the clay say*  
*to him that fashioneth it, what makest thou?* (whe-  
 ther it be meant of *Cyrus*, who though a great Mo-  
 narch, yet was wholly at Gods dispose for the work  
 that he had in hand: or whether it was spoken to  
 check the peoples impatience, that thought long  
 for their deliverance, and to make them willing to  
 abide Gods leisure) S. Paul applyeth it to Prede-  
 stination, and the eternal state of men, in the life  
 to come; This is most evident by that which goes  
 before, and follows in that discourse. The same si-  
 militude you may finde used also in *Ecclus* 33. 12,  
 13. *Some men he blesseth and exalteth and setteth near*  
*himself: some he curseth and setteth low, and turneth*  
*out of their places: As the clay is in the Potters hand,*  
*so fashion it at his pleasure, so is man in the hand of*  
*him that made him.* I pray take you heed that you  
 be not like to *Balaam*, who though he knew Gods  
 minde or purpose, yet because he liked it not, would  
 needs go and inquire again, if possibly he might be  
 brought to speak according to his own desire. You  
 would fain have the Apostles words refer to the  
 eighteen chapter of *Jeremy*, where indeed is spoken  
 of a Potter, and the clay in his hand, but quite to  
 another purpose, namely this: A Potter, when he  
 is framing any one earthen vessel upon the wheel;  
 can, with the turn of his hand, make quite another  
 of it, and not that which he began to make. *Am-*  
*phora*

*phora cæpit institui, currente rota cur urceus exit?* as on the contrary, sometimes he that thinks to write but a few lines, when his hand is in, writes a long discourse: *currente rota, dum urceum cogito, Amphoram fecit manus*; said one that wrote much more than he thought to have done. So saith God by his Prophet there: if I intend to bring, and be bringing evil against a Nation; upon their Repentance I can and will upon the sudden, turn away the evil that was hastening towards them. And if I promise, and begin to do good for a people, to plant and establish them; if they in the mean time prove disobedient to me, I can instantly turn my intended mercies into judgements, and destroy in stead of building them. You may easily discern a difference betwixt these two; namely the Power or *Liberty*, that a Potter hath to make several vessels to several lasting uses, as it pleaseth him: (which the Prophet *Esay*, and the Apostle *Paul* speak of) And the Power or *Facility* that he hath to make or mar one and the same vessel, before it be finished (which is spoken of in the Prophet *Jeremy*) And let not the Vorstian Divinitie so blinde your eyes, that you cannot distinguish betwixt Gods promises, threatnings, exhortations to Repentance, and revealed will, which is dayly resisted on the one hand: and on the other, his hidden purpose, which always takes effect, or his secret will, that never is resisted, and cannot be disappointed.

“ 2 Tim. 2. 21. If a man cleanse himself  
“ from these, he shall be a vessel unto ho-  
“ nour; must either signifie that he that is  
“ not so, may be made so-- ]

A man is made a vessel of honour. 1. By Election, from the beginning. 2. In time, By Vocation and Sanctification, he therefore that through Gods Grace, cleanseth himself, may know he was elected a vessel to honour: so that in these words the Apostle doth but repeat in effect, what he said before, v. 19. *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquitie*: as if he had said. In a great house are vessels of several sorts, some to honour some to dishonour, known onely to God, who knoweth who are his, who not. If any man be desirous to be certified that he is a vessel made to honour, Let him forsake iniquitie, let him keep himself free from the defilements of sin; for by this, Gods purpose according to Election is *executed*, and also *assured* to them that are heirs of life.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XX.

*Whether the works of God do preach  
Christs mediation.*

**A**gainst your opinion, that Heathens were in some sort Christians, and the Rain, Sun-shine and other worldly blessings do preach the Gospel to them, I brought some Arguments, which you endeavour thus to put off.

---

*Sect. 2.* " Gods works may manifest what  
" men take no notice of. The Sun doth  
" shine though I do not see it, and a man  
" may speak what no bodie hears.

I will briefly shew you the vanitie of this your allegation. 1. That which God is said indeed to manifest, is indeed made known to most men in the world. As the heavens declare the Glory of God; so there is no Nation of what different speech or language soever, where their voice is not heard. And 2. The Doctrine of your Catechisme was, that Gods works do bring a man to Faith in Christ: and your *Quest. 154.* with the Answer, is this,

*Quest.*

*Quest.* " How doth God speaking in his  
 " works conduce to Faith? *Answ.* *Inas-*  
 " *much as they evidence God, and what is to be*  
 " *known of him to us, they evidence to us ]*  
 " which cannot be unless we hear and see:  
 " and they dispose the heart to receive more  
 " clear Revelation. ]

Can that dispose the heart, which the heart doth not perceive? This Answer of yours, you say *Seēt. 3.* passes currant without exception amongst the Answers of his commendation. ]

But what maketh you think, I commend all the Answers in your Catechisme that I passed by, and did not mention? I pray do not abuse your self and me so far as to imagine it. But that I should commend this Answer, that contains the same Errour and fallshood that the other did, because I took it not in among them, is the most idle fancie that could come into your head.

---

*Seēt. 4.* " The humblest souls are usu-  
 " ally best at seeing. Even as there be ma-  
 " ny poor despised illiterate men that see  
 " more into Christ and heaven, than many  
 " proud ministers, scholars, and Universitie  
 " men, that swell with conceits of their sci-  
 " ence and despise them. ]

He

He that will beleeeve readily what you say, & take it upon your word, though it be weak and unsound, shall have the commendation of an humble Christian. *Papists* are brought to think, that when they renounce their own understanding, and blindfold follow their guides, it is a high act of humilitie: and you would have it thought that all they who question what you deliver, do swell with pride and self conceit, and a high opinion of their own knowledge. But as worldly want doth not always make men humble, nor penury starve pride, according to what *Solomon* saith in the twelfth of the *Proverbs*, *There is that honoureth himself and lacketh bread*, and as *Gregory* in his *Pastoral*, enlargeth the observation; *Plerumque personarum ordinem permutat qualitas morum, ut dives humilis sit, pauper elatus*, that is, Mens qualities and demeanours for the most part run quite a cross their estates and degrees: the richer sort being in their carriage low and gentle, while the poor are stiff and loftie. So there be many ignorant and illiterate people, that are intolerably proud, undervaluing disdainfully, all knowledge and knowing men; and on the other side, there are many men as eminent and as much above others in humilitie, as they are in learning and parts and promotion.

You tell us somewhere who bred the *Quakers*: but who is most like to do it? who talketh most like them? their name is new, but their manner *S. Jerom* thus taxeth to *Marcella*, *Crassam rusticitatem*



*tem pro sanctitate habent, quasi idcirco sancti sint si nihil scierint.* Down-right rudeness they count is holiness, as if because they knew nothing, they must be therefore more holy than others are. There be some lay-men, whom perhaps you may think to gain upon, and to gain to you, while you comply with them and joyn with them in reproaching the Clergie. But as love that is caused by undue means, doth not long continue, but is unstable and fastidious, like filhes, saith *Plutarch*, that being taken with medicated baits, are unwholsome and nothing worth: So when you have pleased some ill-disposed people in reviling their Ministers, your example hath taught them to do the like by your self, as well as others; and of this you have had experience. But after that conference came abroad, wherein *G. W.* produced your self against your self, reading out of your book the testimonie you gave against the Ministers; although you reasonably well shifted off one of the particulars from your self at that time; yet I thought you might have been more warie of your words afterwards: but I finde it otherwise. One of the badges you there bestow upon your brethren, is, *That they are more mindfull of the fleece, than the flock.* ] Whether it be true or false that you said, it was verie rashly spoken of you, because it is a hard matter for you to know what others *minde*, and what they *minde* most. But do you well know what you meant by the fleece? If you meant not the fleece of the flock,

flock, it is scarce tolerable sense: and if you did, it is a manifest falshood and injurie. For in *England* the maintenance of the *Clergy* is theirs, by the same law by which any man holdeth what he hath and enjoyeth. And is your understanding so extremely superficial, as to think it is theirs who pay it, and not theirs who take it? or that the Laws of the Land should enforce any man to give away that which is his own to another, though never so much against his will? Another may come and out-goe you, but in your own way, and bewail the iniquities of the times, that creditours should fleece their debtors, so as daily they do, when they take what is due to them: and complain of the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of the land for fleecing their Tenants twice a year. It may be you are troubled with an noise you have heard of some Minister, that is compelled to sue at Law some of his neighbours, for taking away some of the fleece from his back, hazarding the loss of all the rest for being so litigious. But whether he be more troubled, and more grieved at his own loss and charge, or at the dishonestie of the people that put him to it, That you know not: and till you do know, you are bound in civilitie and charitie to think the best. But you proceed further in this vein.

---

“ I remember my reverend Tutor,  
 “ *M. Henry Hall* of *Trinitie Colledge*, once  
 said

“ said to us his pupils, We sit here (speak-  
“ ing of the Universitie-fellows ) poring  
“ on our books, and filling our selves with  
“ notions ( or to that purpose ) when the  
“ poor countrey-men ( or Ministers ) run  
“ away with the true and heavenly under-  
“ standing.

With your good leave, I should think, that he did not speak of persons absent (which had been to little purpose) but as he spake *to* his pupils, so he spake *of* them too, who might be so disposed as to need such caution and advice; or howsoever, it was good that they should know, that sanctifying grace is not attained always, nor onely by learning and studie: and it is good likewise for all men whatsoever to know, that it is sooner and more probably attained by knowledge and reading, than by lassiness and ignorance. But why do you not speak against other vocations and employments, as well as against that of scholars and learned men? It is their profession to pore on books (if you will needs call it so) and fill their heads with notions: it is their particular calling, and it sets them never the further off from Religion, nor out of the way to the general calling of Christianitie. Why will you not *let every one abide in his calling*, according to the Apostles appointment? Why do you not speak against manufactures, and merchandizing; against navigation, against building and rigging of ships;

N

against

against rearing fair houses, and providing costly furniture? Why not against keeping Courts, and surveying lands? for a poor countrey-man that never busied himself about any of these matters, may run away with the true understanding. But howsoever the world goes, you must have your years minde of flinging at Universities, and Philosophy, and humane learning, without any colour of good reason, but not without a great suspicion of an ill intent. For suppose that these things were merely secular and worldly, nevertheless to the pure all things are pure: and we may use the world, and all things therein, so we abuse them not: but all Arts and sciences may be, and they are serviceable to the true Religion, and the worship of the onely true God: provided that they do not over-rule, but be kept in good order and subjection. If you would refuse to joyn with those, that will prove man hath Free-will to good, out of *Aristotles Ethicks*, or with those that conclude a Christian is justified by doing just actions, out of the principles of moral *Philosophy*; it were commendably done of you. But when you take delight and a small occasion to inveigh against these peculiar and appointed places, where nature and natural faculties are polished, and perfected, by accession of art and studie, for the better service of God in the State, and in the Church; and when to maintain the sufficiency of Scripture-doctrine, for preaching the Gospel, against the incroachment of Philosophie; you bring such argu-

ment

ments as will hold as much against lips and lungs, as against *Logick and Metaphysicks*: This is no good humour of yours, and it may be a very bad one. And in you especially it is the more absurd and incongruous, who promote the New Light; That the works of Creation preach the Doctrine of the Gospel: yea, who say Essay pag. 14. "*The works of God are true preachers of God, but the force of their voice is taken off, by many of these Ministers that run without Gods message.*" You that speak so much of the open school that is in the creatures, praising Gods name, and declaring his glorie and goodness; do but destroy what you build, in girding thus at schools of learning. For Arts and Sciences, and the studie of them, do serve for lectures, or for commentaries upon the great book of the world. Who can search out and contemplate the influences and motions of the heavenly bodies? Who can set forth the Historie of Plants, Stones, Metals, Meteors, Fishes, Birds, and Beasts, and the works of the six-days-Creation, but such men as have their education in places dedicated to learning and studie? You talk of a School that God hath opened, and you do what you can to seal up the doors of it. One thing I must tell you further, that the greatest enemies that Christians ever had, most opposed and sought to hinder Christian schools: and the most pestilent hereticks that have arisen since the Reformation, have most of all declaimed against Scholastical and Academical knowledge.

And you will never perswade indifferent persons to beleeve any otherwise, but that you speak against learning and learned men, to this end, that your errors and abuses that you put upon the people, may not be discovered; for always among the blinde, he that is half-sighted is king.

“ I am sure many lay-men that cannot  
 “ read Latine, could see the faults of M. H.  
 “ arguings, when both himself and ( if I  
 “ may credit reports ) divers Universitie-  
 “ men, were not so good at seeing them:  
 “ overmuch light makes some men, almost  
 “ if not altogether blinde. ]

If want of Latine be a good help to see by, it may be this was the designe of the new method, to make experiment in curing by contraries; and to put out our lights the better to clear up our ey-sight. It is verie well that you have declared your self in your seventh chapter against *Impositions of Opinions*. I may therefore freely dissent from you in this matter, and I will give you some reason. There is difference betwixt the light of the Sun, and that light which enlightens the minde; because the sensitive power, and the organ of the bodie are but weak and narrow, and if there be an undue application or proportion of outward light, all will be spoiled. But humane understanding, after Gods image,  
 being

being of vast capacitie or comprehension, there is no fear that the intellectual light, which is so sparingly dispensed in this life, whether by acquisition or infusion, should oppress or any way corrupt the facultie of the minde. How it fares with you, I know not; but as for others in all ages, the more they have waded into the abyss of knowledge, the more they have confessed their own ignorance. This light doth discover darkness: but that it should cause any, or make some men blinde, is a blinde and blundering conceit of your own. And now we will return to the particular controversie of this chapter.

---

*Seēt. 6.* You will not grant that the Sun did shine upon *Adam* after he was fallen, as it did before; or if it did, “ yet it spake not the same language, because it spake God kinde to sinners, which it could not do before man sinned. ]

It is pitie to interrupt you in these your deep speculations. Go on, I pray, to prove, that when you turn homeward the winde blows not as it did: and that the Sun doth not shine alike upon the dial, but speaks a new language everie hour of the day; with plentie of the like, never heretofore thought reasonable or credible.

---

“ He brings the saying of the scoffers to

“ confirm his assertion, and justifies the  
 “ truth of it, when the Apostle tells us,  
 “ that saying proceeded out of their wilfull  
 “ ignorance, and minds them that since the  
 “ creation of the world, all things, did not  
 “ continue alike, for God overflowed the  
 “ creation with a flood.]

Thus did the impostours argue: If the world  
 hath lasted for so many ages, then it will always last:  
 But it hath lasted for so many ages: Therefore it  
 will always last. Now the Apostle doth not deny  
 the Assumption, or second proposition, but directs  
 his answer to the Connexion; as if he had said  
 thus: It is too great ignorance to think the world  
 must always continue, because it hath continued so  
 long: for know they not that God is the Lord of  
 nature? know they not that he made this earth as  
 standing and emergent out of the waters, and that  
 after so many years, the waters were let loose upon  
 it, and wasted it? The course of nature therefore  
 doth not abide constant and unmoved, but the  
 power of God countermands it at his own will  
 2 Pet. 3. 7. The heavens and the earth which now  
 are, by the *same word* are kept in store: the Apostle  
 confuteth them, not from the change or alteration  
 that was upon the flood, but from the *word* or  
 power of God that caused the flood: The same  
 hand, or power, or word, that drowned the world,  
 shall when time cometh put an end to it by fire.



So that when the scoffers said, All things continue alike from the first creation, it was true as they meant it; namely, of a continued course of the heavenly motions, and of the seasons of the year: winter and summer, day and night: These and the like abide as they were at the first, notwithstanding the deluge, according to Gods promise, *Gen. 8.* The earth had long ere *S. Peters* time out-worn the flood, and the Psalmist saith as much, *Psal 119. 91.* *They continue this day according to thine ordinances.*

*Seet. 7.* “ Evident it is, they preach  
 “ God mercifull to sinners, as well as just  
 “ to punish sin: and the one is the contents  
 “ of the Gospel, as much as the other of  
 “ the Law.

If by mercie you mean goodness, and forbearance, and patience, these are evidently seen in the works of God. But what is all this to pardon and redemption? where in the mean time is purchase and satisfaction?

And yet actions, if meer actions, are subject to various interpretation, and therefore to misinterpretation: witness the two Service-books that were left upon the Altar over night, and in the morning scattered in pieces all over the Church. When *Julius Cesar* at a time made a speech to his souldiers, the greater part of them being at a distance, could

not well understand what he said, but they perceived by his gesture, that he spake of the ring upon his finger, and thought that he had promised to them all, the honour and revenue of Knighthood: whereas he onely told them thus much: that rather than not satisfie their utmost arrears, he would part with all that he had, even to the ring of his finger. Ceremonies which are actions appointed to teach and instruct, are usually accompanied with a word of *instruction*. When *Esay* walked barefoot; and *Jeremy* wore a yoke about his neck; when *Agabus* bound himself with *Paul's* girdle, and the Gourd withered that shadowed *Jonah's* head; if something had not been spoken, as well as done, there would as little knowledge have been gathered, as *David* would have gathered from the arrows that *Jonathan* shot, if they had not afore been agreed upon the token. The eternal Power, and Godhead, and Wisdome, are seen in the world: but can you tell us one place in all the Scriptures, one word of Institution, whence it may appear, that God ever intended to give notice of mans Redemption through Jesus Christ, by the works of Creation and Providence? If you cannot, it is put to your choice, whether you will hold your peace, or speak to no purpose: as you do in that which follows here. [“How else lead they to Repentance, if they witness not mercie to the penitent, “*Rom. 2. 4, 5.*”]

In answer to which place, I have thus much to say.

say. *First*, That reproof of the Apostle, is bent against the Jews, or if it be to the Gentiles, it is after they were made partakers of the Gospel, or the publication of it. And *Secondly*, To whomsoever he speaks, he is in that place, even to the middle of the third chapter, whetting the Law, and brightning the face of *Moses*, not preaching the Gospel. Repentance belongeth to the Law, which enjoyneth and commandeth it. The Rule that directs me to walk in the way, directs me also to return into it, when I am out of it. Before the Fall, Gods bountie led to Obedience and due service. After the Fall, Gods bountie leadeth to Repentance, as a part of our Obedience and as necessarily prereduced to all future obedience in such a case. It is true that God pardoneth all that do repent; but this is by vertue of the Gospel, and is a Priviledge of beleevers. His long-suffering *to us-ward*, is that none should perish, but sooner or later, come to the knowledge of the Truth, *2 Pet. 3. 9*. But this is the question, whether every inducement to repent, even among heathens and infidels, doth include and contain in it, a promise of mercie and pardon: this I denie, upon this reason, because, then the Gospel should be contained in the Law, and the promise of forgiveness, in a dutie of obedience. But the Law & the Gospel being two several things, ought in our consideration to be kept apart. He that invites to Repentance sheweth plainly he would not have the offender or delinquent to go on, in doing wrong, but would

would have him prevent *heaping up wrath* vers. 5. and increasing his condemnation: but he doth not always shew that he is readie to pardon what is past: that this is so, appeareth by this similitude. A Landlord commenceth sute against one of his Tenants, in order to his ejectment, for not paying his Rent; in the mean time this Tenant, maketh strep and waste, still wronging and by divers abuses provoking his Lord, who nevertheless is kinde to him, as to his other Tenants, in countenance, invitations, and other courtesies. A servant of the Lord thus speaks to the Tenant. My Masters fair and civil carriage towards you, may invite you to be sorrie for what you have done, and make you ashamed to demean your self so undutifully and injuriously. In this case he is invited to repent; but he is not put in hope that the suit shall be let fall, and he be still continued in possession.

---

“ *Pag. 105.* They preach God mercifull  
 “ to sinners, and that is the contents of the  
 “ Gospel. Whence else do poor heathen in  
 “ distress cry to him for mercie and help, as  
 “ in *Psal. 107.* and *Jon. 1.* or offer sacrifice  
 “ in all ages, if they had not instruction into  
 “ the propitiousness of God, as well as into  
 “ his being?

Forasmuch as sacrifices do ow their original to  
 Divine

Divine institution, and the will of God made known by his word to the Patriarchs; It is consequent that the heathen, who did also offer them, did not gather that dutie of their Religion from the contemplation of this visible world; but that it must be reckoned among those Remains of broken knowledge, which from Gods people were diffused among the nations, but much and many ways vitiated and corrupted.

Now you have taught in these words, two great errors, yea, if I may call them as they seem to me, unchristian, and heathenish. 1. That all worship, done to any God, is done to the true God. 2. That all kindness, that God sheweth to sinners, is the manifestation of his Gospel. And thus have you broken down the hedge of the vineyard, or enclosure; and laid it open, in waste and in common, to all the world of Pagans and Infidels: for never was there nation so barbarous, but did homage to a God, one or other. You have brought, not Greeks into the Temple, but Idolaters, continuing in their Idolatries, into the Christian Church, and yielded to them the knowledge of the onely true God, and of him whom he hath sent, *Jesus Christ*. Or rather, as some have taken away all Idolatrie against the second Commandment, by making the first and second all one. So have you taken away all Idolatrie against the first Commandment, when you thus make all one, the true God with Idols, or false Gods, or a confused conception of a Deitie at large.

The

The 107 *Pſalm* ſaith that ſea-faring men, crie unto the Lord in their diſtreſs: if you read the *Pſalm* from the beginning, you will finde Gods own people the Hebrews to be ſpoken of: or what if it be extended to others, that in their diſtreſs they crie unto God? The young Ravens call unto him for their meat; And the eyes of all things are ſaid to look up to him. The earth and clouds crie unto him in a drought. You may read in another *Pſalm* this prayer, which you may reconcile as well as you can, with that which you alledge out of the 107. Pour out thy wrath upon the Heathen that *have not known thee*, and upon the kingdoms that *have not called upon thy name*. You bring the firſt chapter of *Jonas*, where every man cried unto his God: and yet you know that none of them cried to the true God, till *Jonas* awoke and called upon him. They cried to them who were no Gods, but Idols. *Gal.* 4. 8. When you knew not God, you did ſervice to them, which by nature, are no Gods. But what were they then? the ſame Apoſtle telleth you, in the firſt Epistle to the *Corinthians*, the tenth chapter and the twentieth verſe, The things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to Devils, and not to God. You have raked fair, to finde out your univerſal Grace in the Idolatrous ſacrifices which Pagans offered. *Paul* and *Barnabas* might have ſpared the rending of their clothes, and ſaved their out crie. Sirs, what do you mean to do theſe things? And the *Lyſſrians* might have answered thus: but  
 that

that they wanted such a Priest as your self at their elbow to have prompted them : these are no such vanities as you imagine, for by them we do testify our hope in God, and in his Grace ; and by them we do celebrate his propension to pardon our misdoings. We have always served the living God that made heaven and earth, and redeemed all men. Neither hath he suffered us to walk in any wrong ways, but hath been propitious to us in his love and mercie, and hath trained us up in his school. The Sun passeth over our heads every day we rise, preaching Gods name and bringing tidings of his Goodness ; and when the night cometh on, the Moon and the Stars succeed and take their course, uttering to us his saving knowledge : you may tell us more plainly what we knew before, but we have had sufficient teaching long ere you set foot among us. This speech is moulded in your Doctrine, delivered in this Section ; and because it is very bad, false and blasphemous, it better becometh the priest of Jupiter that was before the Citie, than *A servant of God, in the Gospel of his Son.*

I would ask you where you finde Gods kindness to sinners called the Gospel. In the old Testament the preaching of the Gospel contained the knowledge of him that was to come : one of *Adams* posteritie ; the son of *David*, the son of *Abraham* : called the *Messias* in *Daniel*, and in *Esay* 53. a person is described that should come and suffer, bearing the sins of Gods people. In the new Testament  
the

the Contents or Sum of the Gospel is, Christ crucified, and God in Christ reconciling the world. When the Apostles preach the Gospel they speak of *Jesus*, and *the Son of God*, and the man whom he hath appointed. But as for rain and food and fruitfull seasons, which you call the contents of the Gospel, they speak of these, as witnesses indeed of Gods goodness, but as such witnesses, that notwithstanding, the nations went their own ways. Yea, and God suffered them so to do. *Act. 14. 16.* He suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. *Nevertheless*, he did them good, and gave them rain from heaven. This utterly overthroweth the false Doctrine throughout this chapter, or wheresoever else by you delivered, manifestly shewing your self a perverter of the Gospel, while you make the creatures to be preachers of it. Notwithstanding his ordinary goodness, or common kindness, he suffered them to perish. His temporal blessings therefore were not able to reclaim them, nor were they intended for the conversion of their nations: if they had been so, then it could not be said, God suffered them to go on in their own ways nevertheless. *Act. 17. 30.* The times of this ignorance God winked at. That is to say, he overlooked them, he neglected and despised them. He hid himself and was wroth. They were times of *ignorance*, and during these times, God did hide himself, therefore he did not manifest himself, as in the Gospel, or by way of any saving knowledge.



Pag. 106. " That something of the Gospel contents is held forth universally in the works of God, D *Amyrald* learnedly proves against *Spanhemius*. Let M.H. answer him. ]

I might say, let D<sup>r</sup> *Amyrald* answer the promise which he made to the national Synod at *Alençon*, that he would afterward forbear to teach such doctrine, for which you now commend him to your Reader. But why should that be done again that is sufficiently done already? You speak as if to this day he lay untouched, and that no man yet ever meddled with him. Whereas I should think you cannot but know, he hath been answered before now, purposely, and that by divers. I rather think you read none of their answers, because they make not for you; and then (as persons resolute and pertinacious in their opinions, a great man was wont to call *Trivemes étourdis*, Gallies having all their oars going on one side) if you bestow time upon such writers and none else, as serve to nourish you in your belief, you can make little progress in the search of Truth, because your motion is still round and homeward, and if you be in an error, it is like you will still continue so. And yet I must tell you, I would gladly see you answer D<sup>r</sup> *Amyrald* in all those points wherein you differ from him, which you can tell, are very many, and very material. And I would gladly know that you hold universal Grace no otherwise than

than *Amyrald* doth. In the mean time, I will tell you a short storie out of *Atheneus* of a *Spartan*: now you know that Countrey was known to be of a very hard breed. This man, sitting down with others at a feast, and not observing what they did, made somewhat more hast to eat of a certain sort of fish, that was set before him, than he had good skill to sever the meat from the shell that was hard, and withall full of sharp pricks or bristles: but having well broken and subdued the harder parts with his teeth, and tasting the meat what it was, being somewhat loth to lose the pains he had taken, relolved thus with himself, *Thou art*, said he, *a very naughtie kinde of food: yet I will not leave thee now, but I will never meddle with thee more.* I finde now that these Polemicks are but a harsh diet, very crabbed and thornie, the which who so loves had need to have according to the *Comicks* bold metaphor, *calceatos dentes*, and must not stick at any thing that is tendred to him. And though I may seem too forward and rash, in thus *undertaking* (as you call it) and falling on, I will not now go back, nor give you over: but I purpose therewithall not to be so hastie in engaging with any other. Yet as *Florus* said of *Hannibal*, having gotten the advantage of the ground, and of the wind, *vento & pulvere pugnabat*; you do not trouble me much with your blows, or weapons. I fear not your armour, nor yet your arguments, no nor yet your uncivil and disparaging language. But you drive me out of the

the field with your dust: you confound me with your confused significations. I cannot plainly perceive your meaning, and when I think that I have it, you have another at hand, because it concerns you not a little to deal in obscurities and ambiguities, and to have your reserves readie, and places of retreat. And you either cannot or will not perceive my meaning: As here in the Section next following, that which I thought had been plain enough to be understood, you have so taken, snatching one part from the other, as to wring out an impertinencie from my words, that never came into my minde, that so you might have something to busie your self about. *Quintilian* will have his Oratour so to speak, not onely that he may be understood, but so clearly and in such a manner, that he cannot possibly but be understood, even by those that are negligent in hearing, and are minding other matters. There he some, and you may be one of them, that through their wilfulness make this advice of his to be needfull, and a verie difficult task too: you are quick enough and ready to defend whatsoever it be your chance to say: and you seem as backward to apprehend what anothers meaning is. But I pray, if you finde no tolerable sense in what you read, look it over again, and mark it better, lest the fault be found to be in your self.

As for universal objective grace, by whomsoever maintained, it seemeth to implicate in the terms: as doth the *Catholick-Romane*, that is an universal

particular Church. To which purpose may briefly be considered, *wherein* grace, as it is grace, consisteth. Some will tell you that it is not grace, because it is given to one and denied to another, but because it is given to the *unworthy*. But the elect Angels were confirmed by grace, and yet were worthy so far as any creatures can be worthy: And our Saviour Jesus Christ was full of grace, and did partake of Gods favour in the highest degree; yet withall was most worthy. Others say, that if it be grace, it must be added to nature and natural parts or perfections. Now this indeed is *true* of Gods grace shewed to man; but doth no way agree to grace in general, neither hath it any place in such grace as one man sheweth to another, or as a king sheweth to one or more of his servants or subjects.

But you may say to me thus: The subjects of a kingdome may be supposed, even every one of them, more or less obnoxious to the strictness or rigour of law, for submitting to a forreiner invading, or a domestick usurping: if the king be pleased to pardon every one of them, not excepting any; this would be a great grace, and yet is universal: therefore there may be universal grace without any opposition in the terms. To this I answer, Although the grace of the king thus pardoning all his subjects be universal in some respect, that is, in respect of the persons, yet it is singular in respect of the case, or of the time, and in respect of the kings carriage to his subjects otherwhile. And if he should

in  
his  
tas  
and  
cie  
all  
spo  
beg  
grac  
Scri  
alwa  
there



An  
Faith  
works  
Faith  
a Prof  
land of

in like manner pass by all offences against him and his crown, during his whole reign; [this *semper-lenitas* were not grace, but an aberration in government, and a kinde of injustice through excess of clemencie and remissness. But Gods goodness in creating all things, and his providence in governing and disposing all things; these two shining forth from the beginning of the world to the end, cannot be called grace, as being no way singular: For according to Scripture, and common custome of speaking, grace always implieth something singular, or particular therein.



## CHAP. XXI.

### *Rahab and Cornelius.*

“ **I**N my second Edition, because I see  
 “ it might be questioned touching *Cornelius*, I left him out, and mentioned be-  
 “ sides *Rahab*, *Naaman* and the *Ninevites*. ]

And are these any better instances to prove that Faith hath been wrought by means of Gods works? *Jonas* preached to the *Ninevites*, and what Faith they had was by his means: and *Naaman* was a Profelyte, and desired so much earth from the land of *Israel*, as might serve for an altar, and resol-

ved thenceforth to offer neither offering, nor sacrifice to any but the Lord.

“ *Rahab* was brought to her Faith by the  
 “ works of God for Israel, which she heard  
 “ of before the spies came to her.]

That which *Rahab* knew of the true God, was made known *by the Church*, as the Apostle speaks in another case, *Ephes. 3. 10*. Whether by the Church as a glass, or whether by the ministerie or teaching of the Church, that was the school, and not the school of the creatures in which she was taught. God was pleased to work faith in her by the miracles she heard of, so way was made for further instruction.

For proof that there is varietie of means to saving faith, you send me to *Rom. 2*. If uncircumcision keep the Law, it shall be counted for circumcision. Whence you seem to argue thus: Pagans, Infidels uncircumcised may keep the Law, and do as much, yea more than some Jews or Christians that have the written word and Sacraments as varietie of means. *Ans<sup>w</sup>*. There were many of the Gentiles, who were Profelytes to the Jews Religion, and remained uncircumcised, who had the knowledge of the true God, and walked in obedience to him. Jews inwardly and in the Spirit, which were better Jews than others who were circumcised and

and disobedient. What gather you hence, for variety of means? or from the other place following, chap. 3. v. 21. *The righteousness of God, without the Law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets?* Where [Law] in the first place is taken strictly for the doctrine of the Moral Law, whether written or natural, as it stands in opposition to the Gospel: and the righteousness of God without the Law, is elswhere in other words, called The Righteousness of faith without works, or without works of the Law. And in the second place [Law] signifieth the writings of *Moses*, in which Evangelical promises were many ways contained. When you broach such new and scandalous opinions as you do, it is not sufficient to refer to chapter and verse; you should bring the words, and shew wherein consists the strength of your argument or proof.



## CHAP. XXII.

*False conceptions. Four instances.*

**I** Did not quarrel with you, as you say I did, for making cruelty a false conception, but for setting it in opposition to all mercie. If you saw not this, it was your own blindness, whether wilfull or no, I say not, because I know not.

“ He taxes me with partialitie , for putting four false conceptions into the same different character , or else I know not wherefore.]

I think indeed the subtillest of all our Readers is not able to finde out what should be the partialitie to include four false conceptions in the same different character. And withall I think the meanest of all, if he dare adventure to read plain *English*, may soon see where lies the partialitie, namely, in that you charged upon three several parties what they held and ovvned: but to the *pretended Orthodox* you laid that vvhich they ovvned not.

---

“ He says more than I dare affirm I thought of, when I mentioned it.]

You dare not affirm that you thought of it ; yet you say here [ “ It is a vvord that borders upon their principles. ] Novv it comes into your minde, but you thought not of it then. But you dare to say : [ “ I vvvas guiltie of the charge, because I did not pass it by untouched ] so you know my thoughts better than your own. But if I must give credit to you in what you say, though you speak it very faintly, why would not you believe me for what I disclaimed so earnestly ? As it is moralitie and honestie not readily to question what



what others say in this kinde ; so is it also to say nothing in this kinde, but that which may readily be beleevd.

“ Is this man fit to review a Catechisme,  
 “ that would have me put amongst false  
 “ conceptions of God , that he is just or se-  
 “ vere ?

I will endeavour to recollect your understanding and your thoughts, if you will give me leave. Mercie is one of Gods Attributes ; Justice likewise is one of Gods Attributes : All mercie is a false conception of him : All justice likewise is a false conception of him : you, in stead of this latter, named Crueltie. Now though All justice and No Mercie be a false conception of him, and he be not such ; yet if he *were* such, he were not cruel, because crueltie is unjust severitie. And if God were All justice, and did shew no mercie at all, nor free any man out of the miserie into which he is fallen, he were not yet unjust. *All justice* is one thing, this God is not, because he sheweth mercie : *unjust* is another ; this God should not be, did he shew no mercie. It was therefore ill done of you, in that you would not set *All justice*, but *crueltie*, in opposition to *all mercie* ; for in so doing you did obliquely asperse good Christians, as if they thought that God were so ; and God himself, as if he should be

so, did he shew no mercie. And though I am willing to beleieve all things that may be beleieved, yet I can scarce beleieve but that this term proceeded from the same spirit that those other horrid terms did, that I rehearsed out of your other work. And now I answer to your scornfull question, and I say, I may be as fit to review your *Catechisme*, as you are to review the Reviewer, who could not understand him, no, not so much as *where the partialitie should lie*, unless it were in the different character. So much might serve for this drowsie chapter, save that you are here suddenly turned a great friend to the *Papists*, and to *Bellarmino*. For the first, you say, "*You spake generally without respect to persons*" at that time by chance you were altogether Ideal, and dealt in Abstracts onely, not stooping to immerse your thoughts in gross particulars: neither did you charge it on the *Papists*, ( to think God is like an old man ) "*there be many ignorant Protestants as guilty of it as they, I fear*" ] They are guiltie then, and so you think them, but you did not charge it on them, but on the *Protestants*. I hope if I tax you now for partialitie, you will know wherefore it is. But what follows hence to your purpose? You that can tell us that many godly persons think, the time of Beast-worshipping is not yet over; you that can finde Beastly doing, and the voice of the Dragon, in pressing humane ceremonies, are you so ignorant as not to know, that there be *Reliquiæ Latii*, certain Remains of Popery,

rie, t  
and v  
stant  
and  
they  
the o  
my p

I f  
which  
two.  
mine.  
know  
own o  
and o  
falsly  
this is  
Papist  
Prote

rie,

rie, though not by Law established, yet kept alive, and warm in the breasts of many half-baked *Protestants*? You grant the *Papists* to be guiltie of it: and I said not, they onely were: but whosoever they be that are guiltie of it, they own and justifie the opinion and the practice, which is sufficient for my purpose.

“ Yet I think he speaks falsly of *Bellar-*  
 “ *mine*, for though he held it lawfull to pi-  
 “ cture God *in forma hominis senis*, it fol-  
 “ lows not he thought him like an old man.  
 “ Sure he knew God to be a Spirit. Its true  
 “ *Bellarmines* judgement was naught in  
 “ that, but I think *Mentiris Bellarmine*, had  
 “ been better of the two, than *Mentiri de*  
 “ *Bellarmino*.]

I sha'll not trouble my self about the comparison, which is the better, or which is the worse of these two. To give *Bellarmine* the lie, or to belie *Bellar-*  
*mine*. Let him look to the first that said it, if you know who it was: but I must take notice of mine own charge, which is this; *Mentiris de Bellarmino*, and clear my self as well as I can from speaking falsly of him, and which is worse, from lying. And this is no hard matter to do. For first, you yeeld the *Papists* to be guiltie of this false conception: some *Protestants* also as you doubt: but *Papists* doubt-  
 less:

less: thus much your words import. And I trow you reckon *Bellarmino* among the Papists, and what is become now of *Mentiris de Bellarmino*. You that accuse me, do also acquit me from belying *Bellarmino*. But secondly I alledged his words speaking of *pictureing* onely, but not of any *likeness*: yet everie picture is a likeness, everie image is a similitude, though everie likeness be not a picture or image, as one egg is like another, yet is not the image of it. If therefore the Cardinal held it lawfull to picture God like an old man, it must needs follow that he thought him like an old man: as thirdly, he might lawfully do in those things wherein an old man excelleth another man. We may lawfully think God to be like some creature, though not in any thing that imports infirmitie or imperfection. God made man in his image, how can that be if God be not in some things like him? And he is like the Sun, why else should he be called a *Sun*, in the Psalm; and the Father of lights by *S. James*? who yet noteth his unlikeness to the Sun, in that he maketh no shadow by turning, the most dark bodie being to him as a globe of chrystal: and he was like that shape or resemblance described in *Dan. 7. 9.* otherwise he would not have appeared in it. *Likeness*, is of verie great extent and latitude, and a small matter may denominate one thing like another. And fourthly, whereas you say, he knew God to be a Spirit; you know also the Angels to be spirits, yet they may be pictured like young men, and the Cherubims

were  
poin  
pict  
cann  
any  
impo  
pictu  
wron  
thou  
mino  
your  
see, h  
grave  
who  
done  
for m  
cate.



were pictured like winged wights, by Gods appointment. By this your reason, God cannot be pictured at all; and then he should forbid that which cannot be done: whereas God doth not command any thing, nor forbid any thing, that is absolutely impossible: we may possibly, represent God in a picture, but we must not. So that I have no way wronged, or falsified or belyed *Bellarmino*. Now though I will not say to you, *mentiris pro Bellarmino*, and set you on work to compare this, with your other two above; yet any one may plainly see, how you have run your self a ground, and are gravelled more ways than one, for *Bellarmines* sake, who yet will con you no thank: and if you had done him any service, he might thank me, because for my sake it was, that you became his Advocate.



## CHAP. XXIII.

### *The Remedie to be general.*

*Sect. 1.* **T**He Son of God did offer,  
 “ a full perfect and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the  
 “ sins of the whole world. That is as much  
 “ as I desire, or assert. ]

If you may have leave to interpret the words, of the Article, or Liturgie, according to your own meaning and Doctrine, and contrarie to the known meaning of the Church, it is as much as you need to desire. But where doth the Church of England teach that all sins proceeding from the first *Adam*, are forgiven of due debt to the impenitent without further and particular application of Christs Death? *Windeck*, a Papist, who wrote largely of the efficacie of Christs Death, and mustered up 286 arguments to prove that he died for all men, yet called *Puccius, Exécrabile monstrum*, who held that Christs Death was actually efficacious to procure justification, and restore life to all men whatsoever, until by new wickedness they rejected that life, and drew a second destruction upon themselves; and his opinion he calleth *stultum & paganum paradoxon*, a foolish and heathenish paradox, & *pestifissimum venenum*, a poisonous Doctrine that dispatcheth presently, and killeth outright those that take it in. I pray you therefore learn to distinguish between that Redemption which is universal, and that which is particular, belonging onely to such whom God doth choose, and to whom he vouchsafeth the gift of saving faith. Had you done so now, you would have contented your self with those places of Scripture that shew Christ died for all, and not confusedly and dangerously have added those places which speak of the justification, vivification, and salvation of beleevers; as namely these two

Rom.

*Rom.* 3. 23, 24. "All have sinned, being justified freely by his Grace. All have sinned, and all are justified by his Grace. ] *Ans.* If all absolutely that have sinned, be justified, why should he restrain it *v.* 22. to them that beleeve? The scope of the Apostle is this, to prove that the Jews, who thought well of themselves, in regard of their excellencies and priviledges above others, have nevertheless no other way to be justified, and saved, but even as the Gentiles are saved: and that is, by beleeving. For because they have sinned as well as others, and have no righteousness of their own, more than others have, they must be justified as others are, by the righteousness of another. Because all have sinned, therefore all that are justified, must be justified by *Grace*, and none can be justified otherwise. So also is the extent to be taken *Rom.* 11. 32. God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercie upon all, that is, each people, Jew as well as Gentile.

"*Rom.* 5. 18. By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. ] *Ans.* The meaning is, that as all that sprang from the first *Adam* as their head, or root, were guiltie of Death; so all that belong to the second *Adam*, are partakers of life: the very next verse before, there is a restraint to them that receive the abundance of Grace. *Gal.* 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise might be given to them that beleeve.* Is it not the

con-

constant Doctrine of the Bible, that the benefit Christs Death, as to life, and justification and forgiveness, is limited to them that *hear*, and to them that *come*; To them that *eat and drink of him*: to them that *beleeve*, and to them that *obey*? will nothing serve with you to mitigate and mollifie the *æque*, the *rigidum*, and the *aridum* of the letter, but that against reason, against so many Parallel places, and the generally received Doctrine of Christians, the universalitie of mankinde must be intended? It may be you regard the testimonie of *Conradus Vorstius*, more than you do some others: hear his words in his Commentarie upon the Epistle to the *Romanes* ch. 5. v. 18. *Apparet eos graviter errare, qui ex hoc loco colligere conantur omnes omnino homines per Christi gratiam actu regenerari & justificari; nec perinde quenquam perire posse, nisi qui acceptam gratiam malitiosè, suâque impænitentia atque incredulitate, novam Dei indignationem sibi attrahere velit. Quæ sententia haud dubie valde periculosa est.* That is, It is evident that those men are in a grievous error, that from this place endeavour to gather, that all men whosoever are by Christs grace, actually regenerate, and justified, and that none do perish but such as wilfully reject this grace, and through unbelief draw upon themselves, a second time, Gods wrath and indignation; which opinion, out of all doubt, is very pernicious. ] Yet this opinion you contend for, with all your might, as if it were as true as the Gospel, as if it were the very Gospel,

Gosp  
of th

C  
men,  
thus  
" gi  
" eq  
ther a  
guitie  
give  
is, ali  
to an

Rea

Rea



Gospel, and as if all that gainsay it were hinderers of the Gospel.

Concerning the equalitie of Gods love towards men, you refer me to your Essays, where you say thus, pag. 20. " He may take his own libertie to give more or less, as he pleases; and yet deal equally and graciously with all. ] Which is either a manifest contradiction, or a sophistical ambiguity. Gods ways are *equal*, that is just, whether he give more or less: yet are they not *equal*, that is, is, alike to all, because he giveth to one, more than to another.



## CHAP. XXIV.

*Reasons why the remedie should be general.*

" **H**OW doth it appear that such hold-  
 " ers of it love others, seeing they  
 " are my adversaries for holding it, because  
 " I hold it not in all things as they do? Is  
 " enmitie to a man because he is not of their  
 " minde, a signe of love? For he says not,  
 " they be my dissenting brethren, but my  
 " adversaries. God grant their other frames  
 be

“ be righter, for not he that commend  
 “ himself, &c.

I intended not to commend my self, nor all that are of my minde in these matters, but spake indefinitely of your adversaries: if but some, if but a few, it is sufficient. And I hope you will never infect your own partie with that dangerous point, as you count it, of *Pharisaisme*, to say, *Non sumus sicut ceteri*: though now you are readie to censure us for this, and to suspect us for the rest. But as not he that commends himself, is always the best, no more is he that is the forwardest to censure others. There is difference betwixt an adversarie and an enemie: howbeit you, by vertue of your trope called *confusion*, do make them all one. May not a man wage law against his friend, and yet be his friend still? they that plead the causes of other men, are adversaries one to another, and yet out of the court agree well enough among themselves. May not one Christian Prince wage war against another Prince, and yet be in Christian Charitie? he may. And what do you call them, that call you adversarie? You call them the pretended orthodox: which is a term more censorious, by far, and more supercilious then adversarie, which hath no hurt in it, I am your advarfarie, and you are mine: and no man thinketh amiss of us for this, unless perhaps he mislike the cause why we are so. And thus much shall serve for this hungrie cavil, and also for this chapter.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XXV.

*Signes of Gods love.*

IN the second section you explain your self, and what your meaning is, when you usually teach, that we should not gather Gods love to us by faith, obedience, new frames and repentance; namely we may gather by these that the benefits of Christs passion are applied to us for our spiritual life, but we must not gather by them that the Remedie is provided for us. This will I beleieve to have some truth, or at least some reason in it, when I shall beleieve that there was ever any Christian, that did search into his own heart, and seek there for good desires and good affections, and inclinations, to the intent he might thence conclude and know assuredly, that Jesus Christ died for all men in the world: when you can shew me, who he was, that ever yet taught any Christian to do so. You made profession in your fourth page above, "That you armed the children against the dangers and deceits of the pretended orthodox, as Antidotes are to be given against the present reigning diseases." Now their doctrine is that a Christian person from the fruits of sanctification in his thoughts, words, and works, and especially from the frame and disposition

position of his heart, may gather the love of God and the benefits of Christs death for his glorification in heaven. This was the reigning disease, this was the Doctrine against which you framed your Antidote: and not against this, that we should take heed how we conclude from fruits of holiness that the Son of God offered a sacrifice for the sins of all the world, or that he is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that beleeve. I cannot imagine you spake against that which never any man did or was taught to do; but against that rather which all good Christians do practise, except those that are commonly called Antinomians. There is a seed of Gods spirit, which is in this life set upon those that are his, and by which he will own them at the last: and is not set upon those that are none of his. This difference you cannot endure should be made or spoken of; He is a Pharisee that is not as other men are, but if he gives thanks to God that he is better than others, better than this Publican, suppose then this malefactor, or this traitor, which he seeth, or heareth to be executed; This is the poison that needeth the Antidote, this is Pharisaisme, that must be cried down, this is the spirit that must cast out: this must be followed upon all opportunities and occasions. I noted before how you plied this point in one of your funeral sermons: and in another which you preached the year before upon *Prov. 14. 32. pag. 12.* your words are  
 “ But thou wouldest have some signe or token  
 “

“ the truth of this as concerning thee from him in  
 “ something to be done by him to thy soul---- then  
 “ doest thou as that adulterous generation, *Mat.*  
 “ 12. 39. which Christ reprooveth seeking signes  
 “ and tokens: and if thou shouldest persist in that  
 “ way, thou maist be given up to delusion to believe  
 “ lie. ]

But when the Apostle in the second Epistle to  
 the Corinthians and the last chapter, biddeth them,  
 Examine themselves, whether they be in the faith,  
 and prove their own selves; did he bid them do  
 that for which our Saviour reprooved the Scribes  
 and Pharisees? Thus you teach: but they are de-  
 cided that believe you. You coplain, *Brief Disc.*  
 pag. 21. “ That too many of the Teachers love to  
 “ slumber, and content themselves with Dreams in  
 “ stead of searching out the Truth, and giving it  
 “ forth to the people. ] Is this the truth you have  
 searched for, and found it out at last to impart to  
 the people? or what shall we call a sick mans  
 dream?

I will suppose that most of your Auditors had  
 formerly learned, and could then remember that  
 part of the Church-Catechisme, wherein they  
 were taught to professe and rehearse after this man-  
 ner: I believe in God the Father who hath made  
 me and all the world: and in God the Son, who  
 hath redeemed me and all mankind: and in God  
 the holy Ghost who sanctifieth me, and all the elect  
 people of God. And I will suppose also that some

good Christian well weighing these words with himself, should not rest contented with the common love of God, who created all things, and hateth nothing that he hath made: nor with that generall love of Christ, whereby he redeemed all mankind; but should endeavour further to finde that he is sanctified by the holy Ghost, having heard that there is a seal of the Spirit: and every seal is more than a signe, but a signe it is, having heard also of the fruits of the Spirit, *Gal. 5*. If now this person should be perswaded by you and your Sermon, that if he goeth on in this way, he is descended of that wicked and adulterous generation of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, that tempted God, and provoked our Saviour by calling for signes, I cannot think you have done any good service for his soule, but rather that he forsakes the right way and gives over the truth, to be abused by you. When we look for fruits of Faith, this is not to enquire whether Christ died for us, or not, for he dyed for all; but whether the holy Ghost has sanctified us or not, because he sanctifieth only the elect people of God, and consequently whether we have Christs death applied to us according to his speciall intention. If you had perceived any of your people so fond, as to apply that reproof *Mat. 12. 39.* for confirmation of the doctrine you elsewhere teach. By the place and office you are in, and by your skill and learning in Logick and Languages, you should have informed them, that

*Signe*, there, signifies a *Miracle*, or a *Wonder*, above the sphere and force of nature, as *Isa.* 7. Ask thee a *signe*, aske it in the depth, or in the height above. And *Mark* 16. The Apostles confirmed the word with signes following; much less ought you to have put such a conceit into their heads, as if when they examined their own hearts, as the Apostle biddeth them, they were as blame-worthy, as some Atheist or Epicurean, who after all the Demonstration which he daily seeth, should demand some miracle, some signe or proof extraordinary, that God is, and that he guides this present world.

---

*Seet.* 4. The Analogie of Faith, I conceive, is rather that proportion of the  
 “ Faith every man hath, which the Apo-  
 “ stle would have none to exceed in his pro-  
 “ phecying, than any Systeme to be sub-  
 “ scribed by all.]

I was not interpreting the Apostles words, *Rem.* 2. 6. Nor did I say they are to be meant of a sum of those things that are to be held and believed, rather than of the proportion of Faith, that every man hath, and yet I think there may as much be said for that interpretation, as for this. But the Analogie of Faith in common acception is taken for brief Summary of Christian Belief, as the *Apostles Creed*, whatsoever it may signifie in the place

whence it was first taken. Therefore you might very well have let this pass without trouble to the Reader about it : And so would I, but that your selfe used this word in the very same sense, here, above at *pag. 121.* “ Who is there that doth not  
 “ lay down some things fundamentall, contrary to  
 “ which no difficult saying is to be interpreted, be-  
 “ cause it would be against the Analogie of Faith  
 And how comes it to pass that you forgot your selfe so soon ? or what is the reason that you may speak after the common manner, and I may not ?

You often bring up the Pharisee and his words as making much against your Adversaries, in that he thanked God, he was not as other men are. Upon this I noted that a Saint may say, what the Pharisee said, with another mind and to another intention than the Pharisee said it. To this you answer *Seet. 6.*

- “ It was not the Pharisees saying, but
- “ doing, in trusting in himself that he was
- “ righteous, and thence despising others
- “ that I blamed.

But (1) you quoted *Luke 18. 11.* which containeth nothing but his words. (2) *Doing*, if taken at large comprehendeth *saying*. To *speak*, in old Logick, belongs to the *Predicament of Action*. Indeed if you restrain it by way of opposition ; then, to say is of



thing, and to do, is another, yet here in this case they meet & are all one, according to your opinion, and according to your words, in this place. To give thanks for being better than other men are, is *saying* and it is *doing* too, for it is despising of others. To trifle is one thing, to write is another: yet he who sets down in writing meer trifles, to no purpose but that he may write something or other, doth at the very same time, both write & trifle. (3) One of your English Masters, is nothing so nice, as you would seem to be, and yet I think you be both of a mind, for having taught that in the gifts of Tongues and Propheying, with the like, given for the publick service of the Church, *God* maketh the difference. But in gifts of Sanctification, as Faith & obedience, *Man* maketh the difference and not God: he giveth this rule touching these graces, *pag. 266. App. Evang. Take heed of the Pharisees form of Thanks for Graces with comparison to other folks* ] I see nothing to the contrary but that he who thinketh good to follow this rule, must so understand it, not but that he may think himself better then others are, but he must be wary that he thank not God for it, as if *He* had made any such difference betwixt man, and man: he must by all means take heed of that: And then it is easie to see, that upon pretence of being lowly, like the poor *Publicane*, he shall indeed be more proud then was the *Pharisee*, who though he insisted more then was fit upon his own righteousness such as it was; yet sticked not to give God

Thanks, that he was so righteous. (3) Why may not a well-disposed Christian give to God the glory of his Grace, and thank him with such like words as the Pharisee used, that he is so good as he is, and no worse; and yet withall, at the same time, with the Publicane, be cast down in his minde, and crie to God for mercy and pardon, because he is so bad as he is, and no better? I pray think further of it, lest you be too forward in your judgement, and condemn the righteous together with the wicked. And lastly, I would desire you, and all that abound in this sense of yours, to remember, that as *Pride*, which consisteth in reflecting too much upon the good we have, is reckoned among the deadly sins; so is *Envie* likewise, which causeth us to be grieved and discontent at the good that others have. And as there is danger of the one, in those, who exceed others in partaking of Gods graces; so is there no less danger of the other in those that come behind, and have received a less measure of his love and favours. Let not your minde be always on the Pharisee despising the Publican, but think now and then of *Cain*, who was wroth because his brothers sacrifice was accepted, and slew him because his works were more righteous than his own: and of *Esaú* who hated *Jacob* because of the blessing: and of *Jacobs* sons, who hated *Joseph* because his Father loved him more than he loved them, and yet they hated him more because of his great preferment that was

foretold

foretold, and because of the blessings that were upon the crown of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. And as God doth variously dispense his blessings temporal and spiritual, even as it seemeth good to him, and as Princes have their favourites, and our Saviour had the Twelve, and of them, one beloved Disciple; If it pleaseth God Almighty, who is debtor to none, to give to his beloved, sleep, that he will have his Darlings, and bestow upon them all affluence, without their care and thought-taking, while the labour of others, and all their industry is lost; you will never be able to give any good reason, why they may not be sensible of so much, and why they may not with modesty be thankfull for it. And if they be so, it is not the example and the words of the Pharisee that will justifie any man, who shall thereupon say, They are proud, and despisers of others; but let him rather fear lest it be thus taken and interpreted, as if he were therefore their enemy, because God is their friend. Because I will not trouble my self or others with what hath been said, or what need not be said, I passe on to your next chapter.

## CHAP.



## CHAP. XXVI.

*How faith is wrought.*

**I**F you do not think the *Remonstrants* Doctrine worthy of Defence, and your self able to defend it, why do you deliver, and publish it? If you do, why do you deny it when you are challenged for it, and charged with it? It were fair to deal plainly, and not to give your mind to shifts and subterfuges, disclaiming what you hold, and teaching it then, when you deny it, as here you do in this chapter.

The *Hague-Remonstrants* were afraid, it would be destructive to mans nature, if he should be wrought upon any otherwise than *suadendo*, which I Englished, *by perswading*, and you now say, “I confound *suadendo* with *persuadendo*, counselling with perswading. ] I answer, whatsoever difference there is betwixt *suadere*, and *persuadere*, in some Latine writers (for it is not in all) we have in our language but one word for both, and that is *persuasion*, for *suasion* is no English. And 2<sup>ly</sup> *Brandins* the Translator of that Conference doth in the very next place before use the word *persuadere* and *persuasio*, thrice within the compass of one sentence, in the very same signification, with *suadet*, in the words

words that I alledged, pag. 310. *prater alia omnia persuadendi dona, quibus alii aliis prestare possunt, rogamus fratres, quando volumus persuasionū rationes inter se conferendo ponderare, agatne ille fortius in persuadendo, qui aeterna & incorruptibilia dona promittit, eo qui tantum temporalia & corruptibilia? Illud est discrimen inter allicia Dei & Satane.* I alledged the words at large the rather, that withall it may be seen, how little they ascribe to God in the conversion of a sinner, even as much as is in the object, which he propoundeth, and no more. And 3<sup>ly</sup> It is nothing materiall to our enquiry, whether the counsell be followed or no, wh<sup>ether</sup> it be *suadendo*, or *persuadendo*, by perswading or by counselling: the question is, What or how much is done by him, that doth either counsell, or perswade. The counsell given is the same, whether it be followed, or not followed. Who determines the will to follow the good counsell that is given? The Apostle saith, *Phil. 2. 13.* God worketh in us *to will*: so say you too, by giving us good counsell to follow: but if that be all, he worketh it in us, according to our good pleasure, and not of *his* good pleasure, as the Apostle there addeth. "*Perswasio* say you, doth it with the *perswasible* ] but who maketh them perswasible? The work of grace is to open the deaf eare, and to make the stubborn and retractorie become willing to hear and obey.

Having alledged *Cameron* by way of scorn (for so I take it) *Sect. 1.* In your third you bring him in  
again

again, saying, *Dens ista omnia facit persuadendo.* God doth all these things by his perswasion: but in in the same page he saith, God in this life worketh Charity in us, as he doth in the life to come, *sic ut fieri non possit ut non amemus.* So as that it cannot be otherwise but that we must love him, and after in the 75. page, Those who are converted, are so illuminated. *Ut non possint non converti:* that they cannot but be converted. Is this *your* Illumination, and perswasion?

---

*Scēt. 3.* “I thought the new spirit and  
“heart had followed Faith.

Regeneration is an entire work, though in appearance and to our apprehension, some things go before, and some other follow. As faith is a Principle of spirituall life, so is it withall a part of spirituall life. As the life in the Heart, is a part of Naturall life, and withall a principle of Naturall life: So Faith goeth before the new frame, as a part of the new frame.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XXVII.

*No man can hear of himself.*

*Seēt. 2.* “**L** Et the Reader view my  
 “ Answer, and judge of my  
 “ Reviewers honesty, when he thus wrote,  
 “ where say I they are both alike without a-  
 “ ny difference so called? Nay I say quite o-  
 “ therwise; for in saying of the latter, it is a  
 “ gift brought to us by the word of God,  
 “ which I say not of the former, I expressly  
 “ put a Difference. ]

Let the Reader judge hardily, and spare not, I  
 am willing withall: let him look narrowly, and tell  
 what he findes, whether in you, or in me, either of  
*Dishonesty*, or of *Sycophancy*. Your Answer in the  
*Catechisme* was this. “ As the ability to hear the  
 “ Gospel outwardly, is of Gods gift, so the word  
 “ outwardly heard, brings to men by the gift of  
 “ God power of more inward hearing and attenti-  
 “ on. ] Hereupon I noted thus; To hear outward-  
 ly, and to hear inwardly, are in this answer called  
 both alike, without any difference, *Gods gift*, and  
 as far as we may guess by his words here, and in o-  
 ther places both of them are of like extent thus far,  
 that

that look where he giveth the outward hearing he giveth the inward also. Whatsoever the means be, by which he conferreth the gift, still the one is his gift as well as the other, he giveth this, no more than he giveth that, which way soever he giveth it. May they not both be said by you, to be his gift *without difference*, and yet be given by somewhat different means? But you must be born withall for writing thus, if you have nothing more solid to bring forth.

---

“ If the power to hear with inward intention, be an act of special Grace,  
 “ why doth our Saviour fault some for stopping the ear lest they should hear: it was  
 “ not the outward ear they stopped with their fingers, but their inward with their  
 “ oppositions to God; and if that was not  
 “ opened, no ground to stop it. ]

The will is corrupted as well as other faculties of men unregenerate, so that they lie under a natural and a voluntarie corruption. As it is a natural corruption, so they cannot hear and obey; their ears are stopped: as it is a voluntarie corruption, so they are willingly disobedient and stop their own ears. A prisoner, that is besotted with his manner of life, and his companions, and preferreth it before his libertie, may



may say, I will not come forth; and you cannot thence prove that he may come forth if he will.



## CHAP. XXVIII.

### *Of falling from Grace.*

*Sett. 2.* “**H**E adds such a faith as is  
 “ feined and unsound may  
 “ be lost, and truly I think it is not worth  
 “ the keeping: no loss in loosing such a  
 “ faith, seeing if kept it would do a man no  
 “ good, A man may lose it for the better  
 “ even for a righter faith. But I am per-  
 “ swaded that is not it, which the Apostles  
 “ and Christ warn men of, and bewailed, or  
 “ feared any for, that they should lose what  
 “ made them but Hypocrites. ]

Hypocrisie is a moral crime: An Hypocrite is a dissembler, He that takes upon him and personates what he is not. But if you will extend the term so far as to comprehend such as want saving Grace, and are not yet made partakers of spiritual life, howsoever otherwise morally qualified, and conforming in duties of Religion: or if you will put the case of one that is an Hypocrite indeed, in the common sense: If he loseth his faith, he doth not lose that  
 which

which made him an Hypocrite, though he loseth that, notwithstanding which, he was such. But as an Hypocrite is not so bad, as a vitious and openly profane and ungodly person, so an unsound faith is better than none, & a faith historical or temporarie, better kept than lost; Although you very rashly, as I suppose, not deliberately, do here teach to the contrarie. For I pray observe well, *first* that Historical faith is a true faith in the kinde of it, hath a true being, and is of good use and benefit: and it is best for them that have it, to hold what they have, and not think of losing it for a better; for though it be not justifying faith, nor a part of it, nor yet a degree of it; yet is it a step towards it, according to Gods ordinarie way of proceeding in the conversion of sinners: and as a stock whereupon is engrafted saving Faith, when God is pleased, to make that Christian a member of the Church invisible, who was before but a member of the Church visible. And as in the vision of the great tree, that figured the estate of *Nebuchadnezzar*, the stump of it was left in the ground, because God intended to restore him; So there is more hope of good intentions towards him, who preserveth in himself sound principles of Religion, though he be unsanctified, than another who goeth aside in the by-ways of unbelief, or misbelief. And *secondly*, as for faith temporarie, it is not so called, because it *never* endures but for a time, but because it is apt in the nature and constitution of it, to abide but a while, and then

the  
dor  
not  
ther  
2.  
mor  
indu  
faith  
utme  
ed o  
tutee  
ordin  
whic  
that  
the  
ake  
own  
that a  
Pagan  
faith.

In t  
Doctri

then to fail. For in two cases a temporarie beleever doth not fall away. 1. When persecution doth not arise, nor any temptation on either hand; for then he may persevere in his faith, during his life. 2. When it pleaseth God to make use of this common Grace, as preparatorie to saving Grace, and to indue the temporarie beleever with true justifying faith, which is his meer gift, not produced by the utmost of natural and civil perfections, but bestowed onely upon the heirs of life. In a visible constituted Church. God bringeth men home to himself ordinarily by Degrees, working in them first that which is natural, and that which is moral; and then that which is spiritual. And they which quench the spirit, even in the common gifts thereof, forsake their own mercies, and are no friends to their own salvation, though you seem to advise all men, that are not as they ought to be, to turn Atheists or Pagans, for so they must do, if they lose all their faith.

---

*Pag. 135.* “ Such were the Galatians,  
 “ they ran well; were the sons of God by  
 “ faith. Yet the Apostle saith so manie of  
 “ them as were justified by the Law, were  
 “ fallen from Grace. ]

In that place, the word *Grace*, doth signifie the  
 Doctrine of Grace, as 1 Pet. 5. 12. *This is the true*  
 Q *Grace*

*Grace of God wherein ye stand*, in other places also where *Grace*, is opposed to the *Law*: and it is as much as if he had said; You that are justified by *Law*, are fallen from the Gospel, or Doctrine of Faith. You are revolted from the Covenant of *Grace*, to the Covenant of works.

I answer therefore, *first*, The defection of a particular Church, from sound Doctrine to error or unbelief, is no good argument to prove the revolt of a particular beleever from the habit of saving *Grace*; no not so much as of any one individual person from sound doctrine; for an erroneous generation might rise up in the stead of these who held the truth to their dying day.

And *secondly*, It doth not appear that those *Galatians* who stood in *Grace*, did now fall from *Grace*. They did run well, and now they did intermit their course, not forsaking the right way, but halting or stumbling in the way, and doubtless were recovered by the Apostles admonition, as he was perswaded they would be, ch. 5. v. 10. *I have confidence in ye that you will be no otherwise minded than you have been.* Neither doth he speak absolutely in the words you bring, but rather conditionally, as if he had said thus, if ye be justified by the *Law*, ye are fallen from *Grace*, as he saith v. 2. if ye be circumcised. So that from the *Galatians*, there is no such abundant proof as you speak of,

“ The temporarie beleever is not said to  
 “ have wanted truth of faith but root. ]

If they had no root, then they had no truth of Faith, but onely leaves of profession, which *Simon Magus* had, and many other, who yet are said to beleeve. But it is a heart of *unbelief*, that causeth to depart from the living God; *Heb. 3.12*. It was the last sort of hearers, and they onely, that did receive the word in an *honest and good heart*, that is the difference of this fourth kinde of hearers from the other three, and must therefore be in the fourth onely, and without such a heart, they might have some faith, but they could never have a justifying faith, of which onely the question is.

“ The foolish virgins had oyl in their  
 “ lamps, else how could their lamps have  
 “ burned or gone out? But they took not  
 “ oyl in their vessels to supplie their lamps,  
 “ they treasured not up the word of God in  
 “ their hearts. ]

A Parable, is as an instrument of Musick, it is unskilfulness to strike besides the strings. Oyl in their lamps, is the profession of Christianitie in outward works and words. Oyl in their vessels, is inward Grace, or Faith, whence outward profession is maintained and supplied. There was a difference

from the beginning, between the foolish and the wise; and between their lamps, which were not alike provided for: and thence it was, that the one sort went out, and the other continued burning, That it was true oyl that was quite spent and burnt out, as good as that which the other virgins had to feed their lamps withall, is a consideration belonging, not to the scope or intention of the Parable, but to the frame or constitution of it. But have you the confidence to maintain that they had truth of faith, when yet you say, *The word of God was not in their hearts?*

---

“ The house that fell had no good foundation, because they did not do what they heard. ]

You might rather have said, they did not what they heard, because they had no good foundation. Action is rather the superstructure, than a groundwork. But if they did not do, what they heard, then they had not true faith: for true faith is always operative, and attended with works, otherwise it is but the counterfeit of faith.

---

“ What need of warning true beleivers,  
 “ to take heed of falling, or of fearing of  
 “ fence taking, if they were out of all dan-  
 “ ger

“ ger of taking offence and falling: the A-  
“ postles impleie no such impossibilitie of  
“ their falling. ]

Exhortations to a mixt societie or congregati-  
on, must be so delivered, as to fit one sort of hea-  
rers, as well as another, and to be usefull to all:  
In the Epistles that the Apostles wrote to the  
Churches, in which were good and bad; when they  
speak to the good, they speak as if they were all  
such; and when they direct their speech to the  
bad, they often speak so, as if they were all  
bad. I desire you would remember this rule, when-  
soever you fetch any argument of this kinde from  
the manner of the Apostles writing to any societie  
of Christians: and if you had thought of it now,  
you would never have laid any great weight upon  
that place, *Gal. 5. 4. Ye are fallen from Grace*; for  
in the third ch. v. 26. he saith ye are all the chil-  
dren of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Such warn-  
ings and exhortations are usefull to all: for as the  
secure are awakened: and the unsound may hereby  
be made better than they are; so are true beleivers  
held in that state which they have attained. By fear  
of falling away, they are preserved from falling  
away. Care and watchfulness are spiritual graces  
of God, whereby they continue stedfast. When  
many of Christs disciples being offended left him,  
their departure endangered the rest: the twelve  
therefore he kept by him, by asking them thus, will

ye also go away? As for such impossibilitie of falling away, as you speak of, I know not any. That which certainly shall not in the event come to pass; may yet be possible in it self to come to pass. For the Saints considered in themselves to fall away, is a thing possible, yea, very probable, such is their weaknes, such is their danger. But upon supposition of Gods Decree, and promise, and preservation, it is impossible that it should be. They are as frail as glasses, but they are held by a warie hand. God will not suffer them to be tempted above their strength, but knoweth how to deliver them out of temptation. He will not suffer the rod of the wicked to rest, to abide long upon the lot of the righteous, lest the righteous put forth their hands to wickednes. He shortens the days of trouble, that the Elect be not born down, nor sink under the burden. And sometimes speedily takes them away, lest malice should alter their understanding, or deceit beguile their soul.

To prove that there is a difference betwixt true beleivers and Apostates before their fall, I alledged several places, to which you have answered severally and largely. But you have said nothing that hath made any of those testimonies to that purpose, invalid. The two first did shew, not onely, that there is a difference, but that the ground of that difference, is in Gods secret counsel. To those two, I shall onely add now some other the like, and then conclude this chapter. *Joh. 17. 12. None of them*



them is lost, but the son of perdition. And what that signifies, you cannot better understand, than by conferring with a parallel place of the same subject, namely, *Joh. 13. 18. I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen*: in each of these texts Judas is he that is excepted, and in the one he is called the son of perdition; in the other he is said, not to be chosen: and thence it was, he fell away, and was lost. And that Election to life is spoken of there, and not to Office, is certain and evident, for *Judas was* chosen to be an Apostle. When the Jews, in so great a part fell off from the true Church, it was a very great offence. How doth the Apostle remove it? *Rom. 11. 7. Israel hath not obtained, that which he seeketh for, but the Election hath obtained it.* When some turned the Grace of God into wantonness, *S. Jude* to prevent the scandal, saith that such false teachers and their followers, were not good at first, and at best, but such as *crept in unawares*, and were before of old ordained to this condemnation. And when the generalitie of the inhabitants of the earth, did wonder after the Beast and worship him, there is inserted a clause of difference, betwixt them and others, and that difference derived from the very fountain, or foundation of God, the Elect are excepted *Revel. 13. 8. All whose names are not written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world.*



## CHAP. XXIX.

*The will of God.*

**I**F it please the Reader to peruse first mine, and then yours, and but compare them together, I suppose he will not think it needfull, that any thing more be written now, about the title or subject of this chapter. When we are speaking of the will of God, you betake your self to the Free will of man, bringing forth such fragments as have often been served up. I shall onely take notice of some other things which you have fallen upon, no way belonging hither. For you are like a valiant Gamester and will have at all, *autogenax* *Joannes ad oppositum*, as you can hold up any thing that you have said, you can oppose whatsoever another saith, yea sometimes although it be your own opinion.

---

*Sect. 2.* “ But he says God is to be worshipped in spirit and truth now, and not as  
 “ before Christs coming in outward rites,  
 “ shadows and ceremonies, which then bare  
 “ a great part of Gods service. I am glad  
 “ M. H. is for such spiritual worship, if it be  
 “ in realitie, for he may have, it is likely, a  
 “ secret

“ secret intention, contrary to his revealed  
“ sayings, as he signifies of God.]

Soon after this, about the beginning of your next Section, you call it a Threed-bare distinction of, A Revealed will, and secret, and like better of Conditional and Absolute. I told you then, you had often heard it, and I like it the better for being common and ordinary. You say little to it there, and here you make a Jest upon it: and a jest if it be a threed-bare one, as this is, is stark naught: but if withall it be prophane, and Lucianical, it is the more abominable.

To understand, and to make out the two-fold will of God, manifestly delivered in holy Scripture, it concerneth you as well as others, and I think you cannot do it better than others have done: For example, *Exod. 7. 3, 4.* God commanded *Pharaoh* to let the people go: at the very same time he hardened *Pharaoh's* heart, that he might not let them go. Yours of Conditionall and Absolute, will not help the matter here, unless you can tell what should be the condition in this case. You that hold God willeth all men to be saved in your sense, without any difference, till they themselves make it, not conferring one place of Scripture with another, & one principle of Faith with the rest, must make two contrary wills, or else deny, whether directly or by consequence, Gods omnipotence. It being a most certain truth, in Reason, and in Religion,

gion, that God doth whatsoever he will, both in Heaven and in Earth. But others say, consonantly to other parts of Christian Divinity, that God's revealed will is not always properly a will, but only figuratively, interpretatively, or by way of likeness. He is said to will because he seemeth to will, in declaring what he willeth should be man's duty, and what he will accept and approve of, if performed. Now because this is declared by the Law or Commandment, therefore it is called his revealed will. This is no way contrary to his will whereby he peremptorily determines what he himself will do, and what shall inevitably come to pass; which because he hath not discovered to us, except matter of prophecy, or promise, is therefore called his secret will.

Or, that it is his will, by way of approbation, he approveth, alloweth and liketh well of universall and perfect obedience, and the salvation of all men as agreeable to his nature and generall inclination, and as morally good: though he doth not completely and perfectly will it, so as to effect it.

And that his will to save all men consisteth in procuring a Saviour or Redeemer for all men, and ordaining means of salvation more or lesse for all men; not in causing those means always to take place. Thus have we been taught by those whom you had done better to follow, than to take the chair of the scorers, and make a mock of what you cannot or will not understand.

“ But were not the Ceremonies of Gods  
“ appointing then, more warrantable and  
“ futable to *Dauids* spiritual worship, than  
“ Rites or Ceremonies of mans Institution  
“ now, that God never commanded? might  
“ not a man expect more blessing then in  
“ observing them, than in the other now?  
“ I durst not determine positively.]

You compare the Rites and Ceremonies given to the Jews by *Moses*, with the Ceremonies of Mans Institution now. And you do it so, that the people may think, the Rites established in our Church, are appointed as appertaining to Gods service, no less than those which were imposed upon the people of the Jews in the old Testament. Wherein you deal very injuriously with the Church of *England*, and with the consciences of the weak.

Before the Liturgy is declared, that what of Ceremonies is retained, is for *Discipline and Order*, and not to be *esteemed equall with Gods law*.

When the *Gileadites* had erected an Altar, on the other banck of *Jordan*, and that of their own heads, without divine command, yet as a Ceremony some way significant in religion; the other Tribes were highly offended at it, taking it to be a corruption of the true worship, and a kinde of defection from the God of *Israel*. But so soon as they heard them  
protest

protest against any such intention, and declare that they meant it onely as a witness of their consent in Gods worship, and of their joint-profession with their brethren that dwelt in the land of *Canaan*; they gave over presently, laid aside their jealousie add suspicion, and rested well content.

They who have endeavoured to satisfie the Non-conformists, did fully declare these things to be matters of indifferency, no part of divine worship, no way necessary to salvation, no more than any thing else that is done, and ought to be done at the command of a Superiour. They did always disclaim any opinion of necessity, or efficacy ascribed by Papists to their Ceremonies, any obligation of Conscience, otherwise than in civill Laws, which God in the general hath commanded us to observe. The more to blame are they that will not at last, after so many protestations and declarations receive satisfaction.

-If any of those high-flown *Anabaptists* with whom you have discoursed, who are against civill customes, yea against customes of Civility, as well as against Ecclesiastical Laws, and will not come at our Churches because they have been defiled with *Masse*, should argue thus against you, as you have in a sort taught them to do; Might not a man expect more blessing in going to the Temple at *Jerusalem*, which was of divine dedication, appointed and consecrated by God himself, descending from heaven, and by his cloud of glory, owning it for  
the

the place of his mansion and abode, than we can expect in going to our Churches, which are but of mans institution and consecration? I suppose you would shape him some answer or other, I pray let that answer serve for you both.

---

Upon occasion of those words in the Church-Catechisme, [ *To keep Gods holy will, and Commandments* ] you asked your Scholar, what is the will and Commandment of God concerning thee? And you taught him to answer thus: *Gods will is that I should be saved.* ] Upon this I noted, that Gods will to save men, is matter of belief, not of practice, therefore not of precept, hereto now you answer, " That God commands us to be saved, I " prove from *Isa. 45. 22.* ] and there I find these words, look unto me, and be ye saved; this is your proof, because *Be ye saved*, is the *Imperative* mood forsooth! and that is as much as commanding. A most worthy argument! but more worthy of *G. F.* or *G. W.* than of their *Antagonist*: but better becoming one of your Laymen that can read no Latin, than your self: for if they could, they might there have found it, & *salvi eritis*, or *ut servemini*. I hope your skill in *Logick* will help you, not to make two precepts of those words, but to resolve them into a precept and a promise: or if you be resolved to hold you to your *Grammar* and your *Moods*, then let me tell you, that though it be  
called

called the *Imperative*, yet it is not always so, but now and then something else, as *Precative*, carrying prayer or entreaty, for otherwise you will teach, not the Souldier onely with a sword in his hand, but any other beggar, when he asketh Almes, to *command*, for they make use of the Imperative Mood: and *Postulative*, or requesting, as Pay me that thou owest, a *Demand*, not a *Command*: and *Concessive* or granting, as sleep on now, and take your rest: and *Hortative*, as Be of good courage, fear not: and *Constitutive*, causing something to be, or be made, which was not before, as Gods Voice at the Creation, *Fiat*, and the Kings, *Sois Chevalier*: and Lastly, *Promissive*, as Do good and live for evermore: So, that which you call a Command, is a Promise, Look unto me, and ye shall be saved. He commands us to look to him, and if we do, he promiseth to save us.



## CHAP. XXX.

*The Conclusion.*

**I**N your last chapter there is little I shall take notice of, besides that which you have in effect mentioned twice before, namely pag. 2. pressing ceremonies and domination in the Church you call *Beastly doing*, and the *voice of the Dragon*, and pag



36. The Magistrate must not exercise the Authority of the *Dragon*, in appointing Ordinances of worship, and here you are at it again.

“ If the time of Beast-worshipping be not  
“ yet over, (as many godly persons think  
“ it is not) then the Scripture says, all that  
“ then dwell upon the earth are false wor-  
“ shippers, onely excepted, whose names  
“ written in the book of life. ]

And many godly persons know, that there have been and are still many ungodly persons, who would gladly overthrow and destroy all Christianity upon pretence of *Antichristianisme*. The Apostle *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 2. hath given us warning of the danger incident to Reformation, and what the Devices and Machinations of *Satan* are at such a time, and what his Method : and that is this, to drive men from one extreme to another. Witness the case of the incestuous *Corinthian* there, who being at the first tolerated in his wickedness without any manner of censure, was in the next place well nigh plunged into despair, and swallowed up of sorrow; through over-rigorous dealing. When the abuses of *Papery* were to be reformed, not onely the well-minded laid to their hands, but persons also worldly, godless, and enemies to Religion joyned with the rest in the destructive part, but intended to promote

promote Atheisme, when they set themselves against Superstition. Hereticks also, whose opinions lay on that side, were zealous in their manner, but their zeal was more like Wild-fire, which they threw in, to have marred all, if it might have been. For after that Antiquity came to be a badge of Popery, then (1) whatsoever was found to have been practised by the *Papists* in Church-orders, was for that reason rejected. Not a stone must be taken from *Babylon*, for a foundation, or a corner. If the least matter of all were yielded, it was as a peppercorn in acknowledgement of the Antichristian Government. And (2) even the most sacred Articles of our Christian Faith, have been denied, as having come from *Rome*, and thither were to be returned. So the name of Antichrist, the Beast, and the Dragon, served the turne for many heresies, & for all profaneness. A Discourse came forth entitled, *The storming of Antichrist*, a right proper and well chosen word, of which they know the meaning, who had experience of the Wars, and laying siege to Towns, and strong places, and assaulting them: storms of winde, tempests of hail, and of Lightning, do spare nothing that is in their way, having no regard, shewing no mercy, making no difference: for being meer naturall Agents, they always act according to their utmost power and might. So describes the *Poet* his hardy Souldiers, Τρῶες ὅ γ' ἀορί ἵππαι ἀνδρείαι, ἢ δὲ θυίλλαι. not likening them to Wolves and Lions, which have been known

known to relent, and their mouths have been as it were stopped; but they fought as it were a flame, fell on like a tempest, noting, saith the great Scholiast, τὸ ἀλόως ὁρμητικόν, that they were irrationally impetuous, violent without sense or reason, without mean or measure. And much like these stormers were some of those that went among our Reformers both first and last. You seem to extend Beast-worship very far, even to those matters in question betwixt us. But you give no instance, nor shall I insist upon any. I know you can, if you will, distinguish betwixt *Poperie*, and the Christian Religion; and if you do not consider apart, what belongs to one, and what belongs to the other, what to Error, and what to Truth; you may soon do that which tendeth to the weakening and undermining of the whole building. Divers of the Papists have twitted us with the Jews, laying to our charge Judaisme for refusing some Apocryphal books, and for condemning Image-worship, as the Jews do now; and for saying that a man cannot forgive sins, as they also said: and for insisting upon the Law of *Moses*, and the precedents of the old Testament, to prove that unto Christian Kings belongeth the supremacy in ordering matters of Religion in a Nation: he that argueth thus, say they, is more like a Jew than a Christian. The *Anabaptists* had learned this Lesson too; for when they were bent upon such a confusion, as should take away the difference betwixt Clergie and Laitie, they were wont upon

occasion to revile the Priests and Levites, as blinde and ignorant, by demanding of *John the Baptist*, by what authority he did what he did: as if observation of order in the Church, and pretence of *Authority* in Gods worship and service were points of Judaical blindnes and infidelity. Against all these and such like let us remember that the Jews were once the onely true Church of God, and our Christianity came to us from them, and through their hands, & we are all but profelytes to their Church. So that as they had once all the Substantials of the true Religion, both for belief and practice, we cannot suppose but that they do retain many of them still. In like manner the Christian Religion came to us, through the Church of *Rome*, not from the Church of *Rome*; and our profession is but to remove the additions and superstructures of the Papists, by which the right belief and worship have been corrupted; and to throw out the earth with which the *Philistims* had filled the well, and stoped the springs. Antichrists are many, there is false worship on both hands, Anarchie is beastly doing, as well as Tyrannie; and Confusion, as much as Utiurpation.

---

“I cannot but think some prejudice against my person ( I know not wherefore being so meer a stranger to him ) hath clouded his reason. ]

By this Clause, he that will may judge of all your book, as of the sack by a handfull, for it is like the rest, full of confidence, but void of reason, as if your Doctrine were so blameless, that nothing could be spoken against it: Perhaps against your person some may harbour prejudice, but against what you teach and write, no man, unless his reason be over-louded, can justly except. You should have been well assured first, that there was any such prejudice born against you, before you took such thought, and put your self to a loss in seeking what might be the cause of it. For my part, I am as much to seek, what should be any the very least ground of such a vain surmise.

Some little while after the comming forth of this your Piece, a friend of mine, and of yours too, who doth not much give his mind to read Controversies, nor was at that time much inclined out of his good nature, to pitie my condition, did ask me thus; *Who bade you begin?* And because this question is very consonant to your sence, I will now give you the Answer to it. And first, if my charge, which is *that I began*, be in reference to those multitudes of right-believing Christians, who have a long time been offended at your Doctrine, My Defence is this, that if any other whosoever had before endeavoured to hinder the spreading of your errors; then, as I could not have begun, so I would not have followed. There arose indeed some contest between the *Reverend Doctor* and your self a-

bout Vniversity-learning, but for other Heterodoxies of yours, no man, so far as I know, gave notice or publick warning. I *began* therefore because none other *would*, though very many much better *might*. But I suppose, the meaning of the question was not, why I rather than another, but why I would begin *with you*, when as you gave me no provocation. But I pray consider well, they are the Schismaticks, who, though they abide, give just occasion unto others for to depart; He that denies the debt, begins the sute; and he that invades my right, sends for the process. Will you not give others leave to defend their own against you, and and to continue in the things that they have learned, and contend for the Faith once delivered to them, which you with your Innovations and inventions have corrupted? *You* began when you taught and promoted so many opinions contrary to what we have received; when you wrought upon the people to draw them after you; when at last you took advantage of their age, to sow your Novelities among them early, lest they should take a resolution to hold their own, after they were once prepossessed with the truth; when you presumed to contrive your errors into *Question* and *Answer* by way of *Catechisme*, with impression upon impression, for the instruction of children, as if you meant to lay a ground-work for the men of the next generation to be built upon, because the men of this generation are infatuated.

In the next place I desire you to consider, that you have (further than by teaching otherwise) provoked, and as it were sent a challenge to those that are not of your mind. In the Preface to your *Open Door & Upon these*, You do in a manner complain, of the cowardize of your Adversaries, "*that will gird and argue when they get into a Pulpit, where none may interrupt them, but they will not abide an argument or two to their faces.* ] And in your Essays, where you took a very little occasion to *begin*, I finde these words, *pag. 16. perhaps you may say, or some for you* ] and *pag. 22. But haply you or some other may reply* ] as expecting the debate would not end there, but that some or other would maintain the Duel. I do suppose therefore that whatsoever shew you make, you are not much offended. *Maffei* writeth of *Ignatius Loiola*, that he had *donum lacrymarum*, Tears at command, and could weep when he would, and as he would, more or less: So I think you can be angry at any time, and chide when you have a mind to it, though you be in sport, and take upon you great displeasure then, when you are best of all content and pleased. I pray Sir, be perswaded to believe, that I bear you no manner of grudge, nor did ever ow you ill will, as you never gave me the least occasion; and if in this Answer of yours, you have given me any, I have not taken it. It belongs not to me to say, how far my reason is clouded, but my affection towards you continueth very fair. And for the opinions

ons between us controverted, I am where I was.  
 You have brought nothing of moment wherewith-  
 all to strengthen and support that cause to which  
 you are a wel-willer, nor yet to incline those that  
 are wavering and unsetled, to be of your mind:  
 but a twine threed will draw that which is coming:  
 and those whom you have misled, you may mis-  
 lead still, untill God be pleased to shew them  
 better.

# FINIS.

## *Errata.*

Page 32. read *infalibili*. 34. *verum*.  
 p. 53. lin. 20. this; some in. 56. l. 17. large.  
 58. *Hillebr*. p. 73. l. 9. *Princes*. 74. *Petra-*  
*landa*. 129. l. 14. for if it. 163. *Sylence*. 198. *Ad-*  
*thencus*. 35. l. 22. *Not out is uncertain*.



# The Table.

Chap.	Page
1 <b>T</b> ouching the Epistle before the Catechisme	1
2 The word Creatours	23
3 Sinfull lusts	27
4 The Tree of knowledge	29
5 The prepared Sacrifice	45
6 Head of the Church	54
7 The Magistrates power in Religion	59
8 The Law	75
9 Professours to break bread	82
10 Of the twofold Resurrection	88
11 How God had power enough to help man	103
12 Of Universal Redemption	123
13 Whether all in Adam be pardoned	132
14 Election what it is	144
15 Election in beleev'ing	163
16 Election in personal considerations	167
17, and 18 Jacob and Esau, Pharaoh	172
19 Vessels of honour and dishonour	173
20 Whether Gods works preach Christs mediation	178
21 Rahab and Cornelius	201
22 False conceptions, four instances	203
23 The Remedie to be general	209
24 Reasons why the Remedy should be general	213
25 Signes of Gods love	215
26 How Faith is wrought	224
27 No man can hear of himself	227
28 Of falling from Grace	229
29 The will of God	238
30 The conclusion	244

FINIS.